JKM LIBRARY
BX5100.W288
Warren, Ira.
The causes and the cure of Puseyism, or,
3 9968 02641 0301

ACCESSION NUMBER 3453

SHELF NUMBER BX5100 W288

The Virginia Library

McCormick

Theological Seminary

of the

Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

From the Rev. Dr. W. W. Phillips Fund.

RECEIVED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T5-AQK-462

THE

CAUSES AND THE CURE

OF

PUSEYISM:

OR, THE

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OF ROMAN ERROR

DETECTED IN THE

LITURGY, OFFICES, HOMILIES, AND USAGES

OF THE

EPISCOPAL CHURCHES OF ENGLAND AND AMERICA;

WITH A PROPOSED REMEDY.

BY IRA WARREN,
LATE THE EDITOR OF THE "MONTHLY EPISCOPAL OBSERVER."

"How little did the venerable men — the martyrs of the English Church — imagine what they were doing, and what harvest for their country they were preparing, when, from a mistaken anxiety to conciliate the adherents of the ancient idolatry, they professed their submission to the very authors of that idolatry, and admitted into the constitutions they formed, the roots of the ancient delusion, and the germs of an after-growth of polytheism!"

ISAAC TAYLOR.

McCormick LIBRARY Theological Seminary

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY CROCKER & BREWSTER.
NEW YORK: M. W. DODD.
PHILADELPHIA: HENRY PERKINS.
1847.

2868

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1847, by
IRA WARREN,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

Stereotyped by
GEORGE A. CURTIS;
NEW ENGLAND TYPE AND STEREOTYPE FOUNDERY,
BOSTON.

BX
5100
W28

PREFACE.

Being an Episcopalian, the author of this work has written with a desire, not to injure, but to benefit, the Episcopal church. He has attacked nothing essential to its spread in the world. On the contrary, he has assailed those things only which are destructive of its interests, and which cast a mildew upon all its prospects of usefulness in this country. In a word, he has attacked those things only which he firmly believes to be essentially popish, and which engender popery. These, when attempting to write on tractarianism, his christian honor, as well as his protestant instincts, have compelled him to attack. His Episcopalian friends will please to observe that he is not assailing them. Far otherwise. They are his brethren, fastened to him by the bonds which surround a common household. Their interests are his interests. He has no private or public wrongs to avenge; and if he had, vengeance is not his. He has the kindest feelings towards his brethren; and in their presence he now washes his hands of any intent except that of doing something to drive popery from the Episcopal church.

Boston, May 3, 1847.

CONTENTS.

CAUSES OF PUSEYISM.

PART I.

THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT.

THE REFORMATION OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES NEVER COMPLETED.

CHAPTER I. PAGE

The English Reformation accidental in its Origin, ... 19

CHAPTER II.

The English Reformation accidental in its Progress, ... 25

CHAPTER III.

The English Reformation incomplete as to Doctrines, ... 35

CHAPTER IV.

The Reformation incomplete as to Usages, ... 41

CHAPTER V.

The Reformation incomplete as to the Numbers Reformed, . . . 50

CHAPTER VI.

Results of an unfinished Reformation, ... 61

PART II.

CAUSES WHICH HAVE PREVENTED THE COMPLETION OF THE REFORMATION IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH, AND IN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER I.

Tolerance of Romish Error, ... 73

CHAPTER II.

Intolerance of Purity in Worship, ... 84

PART III.

THE THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

THE PRAYER-BOOK NEVER FULLY PURGED OF THE REMAINS OF PAPAL ERROR.

CHAPTER I.

Method of interpreting the Prayer-book, ... 96

CHAPTER II.

The Communion Office, ... 100

CHAPTER III.

The Baptismal Office, ... 115

CHAPTER IV.

The Catechism, ... 125

CHAPTER V.

Office for the Burial of the Dead, ... 130

CHAPTER VI.

Ordination Office, ... 133

CHAPTER VII.

The Declaration of Absolution, ... 139

CHAPTER VIII.

The Calendar, ... 145

PART IV.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENT.

CERTAIN USAGES SANCTIONED AND USED BY THE EPISCOPAL CHURCHES OF ENGLAND AND AMERICA, WHICH NECESSARILY, ON PHILOSOPHICAL PRINCIPLES, BEGET ROMISH VIEWS AND ROMISH FEELINGS.

CHAPTER I.
Usages which imply and teach False Doctrine, ... 148

CHAPTER II.
Usages which beget Romish Feelings, ... 168

PART V.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENT.

CERTAIN OPINIONS AND CUSTOMS ADOPTED BY THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, WHICH GIVE INCREASED ACTIVITY TO THE CAUSES OF PUSEYISM ALREADY DESCRIBED.

CHAPTER I.
The Notion of Catholic Consent, ... 178

CHAPTER II.
Authority of the Church, ... 186

CHAPTER III.
Teaching of the Church, ... 203

CHAPTER IV.
High Views of the Ministry, ... 205

CHAPTER V.
Tyrannizing High Churchism, ... 212

CHAPTER VI.
Falling Back in Times of Trial, ... 219

CHAPTER VII.
Some of the first Stepping-stones, ... 227

CHAPTER VIII.
Are these the true Causes? 232

CURE OF PUSEYISM.

PART VI.

CHAPTER I.
Revision of the Prayer-book and Homilies, ... 242

CHAPTER II.
Abridgment and Simplification of Usages, ... 249

CHAPTER III.
Purification of our own Minds, ... 254

CHAPTER IV.
Disciplinary Cleansing of the Church, ... 260
Conclusion, ... 263

INTRODUCTION.

It is well known that about twelve years since, a series of publications were commenced at Oxford, England, entitled "*Tracts for the Times.*" For a while, the doctrines and usages inculcated varied so little from the general sentiment in the English church, that they attracted attention for their earnest tone and their general display of learning and ability, rather than for any lack of soundness in the faith. The appeal of these writers was first to antiquity; and they seem to have studied and represented the early fathers only preparatory to studying and representing their successors. Indeed, so nearly did the progressive corruption of doctrine and usage in these tracts resemble the historical facts developed from the year 200 to the assembling of the council of Trent, that *Track of Time* would be a far more appropriate designation for them than "*Tracts for the Times.*" As these publications went forward, and the germ of one error after another began to blot their pages, discerning minds began to discover them, and to exhibit symptoms of alarm. It was a long time, however, before there was anything like a general commotion; and it was only when they had reached the enormous number of *ninety*, and had brought antiquity down to the

sixteenth century, and adopted the papal decrees of Trent, —the damnatory clauses excepted,—that public indignation was so far awakened as to arrest their further publication.

Thoughtful observers in this country saw the havoc produced, and feared the result; but they still *hoped* that the miasm engendered abroad would not be floated to our atmosphere, and that the Episcopal church of this country would escape the infection which had so deeply diseased the mother church of England. It was a vain hope. As we have imitators of foreign fashions, so there were not wanting those who were ready to adopt imported doctrines. Seven years ago, an edition of the "Tracts for the Times" was published in New York; and it need surprise no one that the highest of the old-fashioned high churchmen, as well as all the young amateur sprigs of theology, who had chosen the clerical profession because it would clothe them in black silk and white linen, and invest them with a degree of imagined gentility, seized upon it with avidity. In short, the infection spread with great rapidity. High church presbyters, in their sermons, extolled the "Tracts" as the best expositors of christian doctrine; bishops, in their conventional addresses, praised them as embodying the results of the highest attainment in primitive theology, and the best presentation of apostolic truth, in the apostolic spirit. Moderate men spoke of them as containing much truth, mixed with a little error, and thought the truth should be received and the error rejected; while here and there a solitary voice, and one Episcopal press, the Episcopal Recorder of Philadelphia, uttered bold and fearless denunciations against them, as containing the substance of the

Roman heresy, and as tending to the overthrow of protestant truth. So limited, however, was the sphere of vigorous opposition, that the principles of the tracts advanced with greater and still greater rapidity, until, in the summer of 1843, a young man who openly, in the presence of his examiners, professed his belief in the papal decrees of Trent, was ordained, in spite of public remonstrance, to the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal church. This young man was educated in the General Theological Seminary, and was ordained in the largest diocese in the country, and by a bishop exercising at that time a leading influence; it was, therefore, a crowning act of apostasy, and deeply wounded the honor of the whole American Episcopal church. The act was like an earthquake; it seemed likely for the time to open the earth and entomb the persons immediately concerned, and shook the Episcopal church to its most distant extremities. From this time forward, the number of open opposers was greatly increased. Yet Tractarianism continued to increase; and is at this moment advancing as fast as ever. If I were asked why it is not yet arrested, I should say, for the simple reason, that its *causes* have not yet been discovered and removed. To discover and expose these causes, and to propose a remedy, will be the object of the following pages.

The attempt has been made to break the force of whatever may be said in this treatise, by representing its author as no longer attached to the Episcopal church, and as about to leave its communion. In view of this fact, I trust I may say, that during a membership of eighteen years, there has never been an hour or a moment when I

did not love the Episcopal church. I love it still. I have ever indulged the hope that this church will not only continue as it has been, one of the bulwarks of the protestant faith, but that it will become the very fountain head of pure gospel preaching, and the leading division of that army which, in the name of the Lord of Hosts, shall conquer the world. With these views and feelings,—though I confess they have of late been somewhat shaken,—I can have no thought, unless its errors become incurable, of ever leaving its communion. The language of my heart *now* is, "Her people shall be my people, and her God my God—let me enjoy her smiles while I live, and in her arms be gathered to my fathers."

But while I say all this, I am obliged to add, that the Episcopal church has *many defects*.* Of these, although for a number of years I was accustomed to hold almost weekly intercourse with the public through Episcopal prints, I was permitted to say nothing. *Here*, every avenue to the public mind was shut against me; and not against me only, but against every man who dared to raise a note of warning or remonstrance.

With this state of things I have long been dissatisfied. Having studied, to some extent, the history, doctrines, formularies and usages of the Episcopal church, I find there are many things which, in my humble opinion, ought to be

* Since writing the above, I have discovered a passage in "Bishop Burnet's History of his Own Times," so much like it in sentiment, that I take pleasure in giving it to the reader. He says,—"I have always had a true zeal for the church of England; I have lived in its communion with great joy, and have pursued its true interests with unfeigned affection. Yet I must say there are many things in it that have been very uneasy to me."—*Vol.* ii., p. 634.

reformed or given up, but which are growing worse and worse, with no prospect of amendment, unless those in high places can be reached with reproofs which we have all hitherto failed to apply, either for want of courage, or lack of the means of doing so. I am persuaded that the old leaven of popery was not wholly purged out of the English church at the reformation; that it remains diffused through the formularies, which we, as a denomination, have inherited from that church; and that from the fermentation of this leaven have sprung up those popish bubbles with which the *doughy* portion of our communion is so thickly covered over. I am convinced, still further, that unless this corrupting portion of error is removed, we shall continue to manifest Romeward tendencies to the end of time. Our misfortune is, that the larger portion of even the evangelical clergy do not see this. Their cry is, "Let us cling to the church *as it is*." Although the prayer-book, in its preface, takes the ground that, "by common consent and authority," whatever belongs to "forms and usages" "*may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions*," yet this wholesome provision has become a practical nullity, from the extreme horror with which the majority of the clergy have come to regard the idea of making the slightest alteration in the ritual which our fathers have left us. "The church as it is," "The prayer-book as it is," "The usages of the church as they are," these are the watch-words which pass from mouth to mouth, and from print to print; and hence, the first uttered word which implies that

anything in the constitution of the Episcopal church, in its usages, or in its ritual, is not as perfect as possible, is either frowned or flattered into silence.

Such being the facts of the case, I have deemed it incumbent upon me to attempt to speak in the public ear through some independent channel, and have thought the mode selected the most unobjectionable of any. Strongly as I love the church of my choice, and much as I desire its ultimate extension in the earth, I am yet willing, if need be, to do something to check its advance until a remedy can be applied; for I am persuaded that, under present circumstances, with the tractarian influence shaping and swaying its policy, its growth is not desirable.* I would rather see every branch of God's church *without episcopacy*, than the Episcopal church without a *life-imparting gospel*.

I am persuaded that a remedy cannot be found for the evils of which I complain, until the laity can be reached with an appeal which shall stir them to action. It is clear, that the clergy as a body, including a majority of the evangelical portion, cling to the objectionable things of which I speak, with great tenacity. It is surprising what a fondness they manifest for the unsavory leeks which our fathers

* Some three years since, the Hon. William Jay, of Bedford, New York, a distinguished member of the Episcopal church, was invited to contribute something towards the erection of a place of worship for an Episcopal congregation just gathered in his neighborhood; but in a public letter he declined, on the ground that such was the course of things among us, he could have no guarantee that any church edifice he might aid in building would not soon be perverted to the dissemination of principles at war with all he held dear as a protestant. For the present, until a remedy could be found for these things, he preferred to distribute his charities where he had more confidence that they would not be turned aside from their intended use. I have not his letter at hand, and speak of it from recollection.

brought from spiritual Egypt, when led out from thence at the reformation. Trifling things, more worthless than straws, which render the Episcopal church unpopular, and hinder its growth and usefulness in the world, great numbers of the clergy fondle and caress, as a man would a pet dog which he had learned to consider essential to his happiness. My aim, therefore, in the following pages, is to reach the laity, and to press upon their attention a succession of topics, which, by great effort, and to the manifest injury of our denomination, have been kept out of view. No doubt, the theme to many of our people will be a new one, but not, I trust, the less inviting on that account. If I am not mistaken, it will awaken the more interest from the care with which it has been hitherto concealed. At any rate, my desire is to see it awaken a general concern among us for the purity of the gospel. I would have an interest in this matter reach all the borders of our denomination, and the General Convention made to feel so heavy a pressure of public sentiment from without, and so imperative a prompting from within, as to be willing to take the matter in hand, and *revise the liturgy, making it thoroughly protestant.* To favor this object, I invite the coöperation of all the christian churches in this land, of every name. I ask them to invite the attention of their own people to the subject; to give this volume a wide circulation among them; and in every way to do what they can to awaken a public feeling which shall have moral force enough to make itself felt. I ask this in behalf of the gospel, in which all have a common interest. The Episcopal church already embraces a very considerable

portion of the wealth and talent of the country, and is fast augmenting its worldly strength from these sources. Should it, in the inscrutable providence of God, become thoroughly pervaded with the papal leaven, and in any measure moulded to the papal spirit, (and such the tractarian portion has already become,) it can hardly be conceived what a formidable power its wealth and talent would associate with the popish interest, and ply to the same general end; and how mighty and destructive an engine would be added to the forces which make war upon the saints of God. It is painful to indulge a thought of the *possibility* that such a perversion may ever overtake the church of my choice. And yet, if the word of God is true, and history is not a lie, I know that such a fall is possible. Rome was once a pure church, but in her pride she fell into a pit from which she may never recover.

The writing of this book has brought against me a host of prejudices, and has destroyed friendships which I have held very dear. This last result I hoped to avoid; but as it has turned out otherwise, I can with a clear conscience place it to the account of my misfortune, and not my fault. Much as I value and love the evangelical clergy who are known to me, I cannot purchase a continuance of their kind regards at the expense of keeping silence on this subject. *Some*, I have reason to believe and know, agree with me, and rejoice to see this effort, ineffectual though it may be, to do something towards removing the evils which afflict the Episcopal church; others, dissenting in part from what I advance, do yet, in consideration of the uprightness of my motives, continue their friendship for me. The few or

many who compose these two classes, I hold dearer than ever. From the remainder I part in sorrow, as from the victims of a wretched delusion.

While I say this, however, I must add, that I do not write primarily or mainly for the clergy. My appeal is to the laity; and among them, I know there are hundreds and thousands who will respond to what may be said. Nothing can hinder this response, unless it be an effort to prevent them from reading. Against this, I hope they will firmly set their faces. From the action of nearly all the Episcopal conventions in the country for the last few years, it is manifest that the clergy are far higher in their notions than the laity. Still, the laity have been silent. It is time that one of their number should be heard.

There are great numbers of the Episcopal clergy who heartily reject and warmly oppose distinctive tractarianism; but they do not believe the cause of it exists, in any manner or degree, in our liturgy, homilies and usages. The main object of the writer of this volume is to convince these persons that they are mistaken. In treating of the "offices," &c., he had, therefore, nothing to do beyond showing that the roots of Puseyism *are there;* for if evangelical Episcopalians can be convinced of this, a remedy will soon be applied. His plan did not at all embrace a discussion of "baptismal regeneration," and other kindred subjects; for, on these he considers the views of evangelical Episcopalians as substantially sound and consistent. They, not less than he, have a lively sense of the enormous evils we are suffering. His only wish is to draw their attention to the fountain head of our troubles.

It is but just to say, that the errors respecting the sacraments, pointed out as existing in the offices, catechism, &c., were not peculiar to the English reformers. With the exception, perhaps, of Zuinglius, all the continental reformers were more or less infected with them. They were errors, not of the English reformers, but of their times. The sixteenth century was an age of sacramental delusion. Nearly all the reformers in England and abroad wrote, and spoke, and acted, with a sacramental veil upon their faces. Luther speaks thus of baptism:

"Perhaps to what I have said on the necessity of faith, the baptism of little children may be objected; but as the word of God is mighty to change the heart of a wicked man, who is not less deaf nor less helpless than an infant, so the prayers of the church, to which all things are possible, *change the little child*, by the faith it pleases God to put in his heart, and thus purifies and renews it." *

The English reformers, then, ought not to be so much blamed for *holding*, as the English church for *retaining*, views of which the better light of subsequent ages should have induced a rejection.

* D'Aubigné's Reformation, vol. ii., p. 123.

McCormick
LIBRARY
Theological Seminary

CAUSES OF PUSEYISM.

PART I.

THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT.

THE REFORMATION OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES NEVER COMPLETED.

CHAPTER I.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION ACCIDENTAL.

The reformation in the English church was accidental in its *origin*. I mean by this, that it grew out of a fact which produced it as an accidental, and not as a designed event. The promoters of it did not hold it up as an *end* to be sought and gained; but effected it, for the most part, unintentionally, while in pursuit of another and distinct object. That other object was the wresting of the rights of the crown of England out of the hands of the Roman pontiff. This was the great, leading aim which directed and controlled the first reformatory movement in England. It was a battle between Henry VIII. and the pope; the former struggling to break the fetters which a spiritual despot had put upon him; the latter using all his arts to hold his victim fast in his toils. In its origin, therefore, it had no aim save this, to set the king and nation of England free from the secular encroachments of the secularized see of Rome. In proof of this, I might cite

the whole array of facts which attended the birth of that long-continued and vacillating struggle.

From the earliest encroachments of the papal supremacy upon the prerogatives of the English crown, a struggle of resistance, more or less vigorous, had been kept up. During some reigns, the royal power had asserted its rights in manly tones, and thrown very serious obstacles in the way of the advancing enemy; under others, resistance was feeble and indecisive, and did very little to check the progress of usurpation. Henry VIII., in whose reign this reformation began, was himself a bigoted papist. He was a man of considerable ability, and was somewhat distinguished as a scholar. At rather an early period of his life, he wrote a book against Luther in defence of the seven sacraments of the Romish church, which procured for him the title of "*Defender of the Faith.*" He courted the pope with a constant and servile submission, and identified his own interests so entirely with those of the Roman see, that, in the language of a historian, "Had he died at any time before the nineteenth year of his reign, he could scarce have escaped being canonized, notwithstanding all his faults."

Devoted as Henry was to the see of Rome, he would probably never have called in question the papal authority, had not the pope made a final decision against his divorce from Queen Katharine, and marriage to Anne Boleyn. On this change in his matrimonial relation, the king's heart was steadfastly bent; but so bigoted was his reverence for the authority of the self-styled successor of St. Peter, that he spent several years in attending to little else than devising means for obtaining a dispensation from the pope. Finding, after he had exhausted all the arts

of diplomacy and all the terms of flattery and entreaty, that the pope was inexorable, he was shut up to the necessity of first doubting, then denying, and finally resisting a claim which many of his predecessors had stoutly withstood.

Thus began the movement which carried the English reformation *in its train.* The first step taken was a denial of the pope's supremacy; and the overthrow of this supremacy was sought, not as an end, but as the means of securing another object. Its invalidation was desired, not because it was an unscriptural usurpation, destructive of the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, but because it stood like a wall of fire across the path which led to the object of Henry's desires. It is questionable, indeed, whether, at the time this first step was taken, there was any thought of *a reformation in religion* entertained by the king and parliament. It was a mere struggle for temporal power, looking to no object beyond the advancement of this or that secular interest. This appears probable from the language of an act of parliament, passed in 1533, soon after Henry's marriage to Anne Boleyn. "'The preamble bears," says Burnet,* "that the crown of England was imperial, and that the nation was a complete body within itself, with a full power to give justice in all cases, spiritual as well as temporal; and that in the spirituality, as there had been at all times, so there were then men of that sufficiency and integrity, that they might declare and determine all doubts in the kingdom; and that several kings, as Edward I., Edward III., Richard II., and Henry IV., had by several laws preserved the liberty of the realm, both spiritual

* Hist. Ref., vol. i., p. 206.

and temporal, from the annoyance of the see of Rome, and other foreign potentates; yet many inconveniences had arisen by appeals to the see of Rome in cases of matrimony, divorces, and other cases, which were not sufficiently provided against by these laws; by which not only the king and his subjects were put to great charges, but justice was much delayed by appeals; and Rome being at such a distance, evidences could not be brought thither, nor witnesses, so easily as within the kingdom; *therefore* it was enacted, that all such causes, whether relating to the king or any of his subjects, were to be determined within the kingdom, in the several courts to which they belonged, notwithstanding any appeals to Rome, or inhibitions and bulls from Rome."

The causes here set forth for prohibiting appeals to Rome are, that the English nation was a complete body within itself; that there were men enough possessing spiritual discernment sufficient to determine all cases without such appeals; that the king and his subjects were put to heavy charges, and justice was delayed by fixing its seat at so great a distance. Not one word is said about reforming an abuse of spiritual power. Indeed, the *foundation* of the breach with Rome seems to have been laid by an act of parliament in 1532, by which the payment of annuities to the Roman court was restrained. And the reason recited by historians for the passage of this act is, that by the payment of their first fruits, large sums of money were carried out of England, to the impoverishing of the kingdom. The primary, and indeed the only object of these acts, appears to have been, to free the liberties and crown of England from foreign trammels.

In saying this, I would not be understood as implying that any thought of a reformation in religion

was altogether a new thing in England; much less that there was no preparation in the English mind for the spiritual reforms which the secular movements brought along with them. From the time of Wicliff, who translated the Bible into English, the principles of the reformation afterwards developed had been making gradual advances. To the Bible which he translated into the vulgar tongue, Wicliff prefixed a long preface, in which he reflected, in strong terms, and with just severity, on the vices and general profligacy of the clergy. And though his writings were not distinguished for beauty of style, yet they made so direct an appeal to the good sense of the middle classes, that he soon had followers scattered over the whole kingdom, making no public profession of his opinions, — which it would not have been safe for them to do, — but holding them in private, and gradually infusing them, as opportunity offered, into minds with which their daily calling brought them into contact. There breathes in all his writings a fearless simplicity, a total disregard and contempt for frowning despotism. His principles of religious freedom wrought in him an elevation of soul which sought for his conduct only an approving conscience, and the approbation of his God. And we are assured by the most abundant evidence, that the testimony he was continually bearing against Romish assumptions and oppressions, was soon found, as we have intimated, in full harmony with the tone of feeling among a large proportion of the people. The attentive observer of human affairs will perceive, therefore, that, however much was incidentally done at the reformation, the great Ruler of nations had been long preparing the way for its accomplishment. Not merely the life and writings of Wicliff, but a variety of other circum-

stances, had fitted the public mind for the results then witnessed. The open violence of some of the popes, the shameless and profligate lives of some others of those high functionaries, the notorious licentiousness which generally characterized their court and capital, the shockingly corrupt morals of the clergy generally, the gross ignorance and effrontery of the several orders of the mendicants, — these, and other abuses, contributed to make the reforms afterwards effected comparatively easy. It is no less true in all other convulsions and upheavings of society than in this, that there must be for some time previous some profound impulses accumulating upon the public mind.

Some are apt to look upon the reformation as standing on the utmost verge of moral life, and to regard all beyond as lying in unbroken sleep, and surrounded with darkness impenetrable. They are disposed to consider this great moral revolution as combining within itself all the principles of an ultimate cause, as standing at the extreme starting point of that series of revolutions which followed in its train. The thought is unphilosophical; it contradicts all just views of the *progress* of changes in individual and national character.

The admission of all this involves no denial of the fact that the reformation in England was, in its origin, a secondary and unintended work. But for this preparation, it probably could not have been effected. Nevertheless, its chief supporters aimed, primarily, at another end, and made this the instrument of securing their chief object. While, therefore, we must magnify the wisdom and grace of God in educing good out of evil, we can award to the king and parliament the praise of no higher motive than the desire to secure the wealth, power and independence of the English nation.

CHAPTER II.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION ACCIDENTAL IN ITS PROGRESS.

My next position is, that the English reformation was accidental in its *progress;* that is, it was mainly so, though not exclusively.

In sustaining this position, I need not confine myself to events which transpired subsequently to the rupture of friendship between Henry VIII. and the pope. That was the first movement towards the breaking, in England, of the *temporal* power of the sovereign pontiff. Official acts had been previously resorted to by those in authority, to suppress some of the corrupt and corrupting appendages of the papal system. The suppression of monasteries was effected in a way which illustrates what I am now saying. Henry VIII. was fond of making a display of learning, and so was Cardinal Wolsey; and in the earlier part of Henry's reign, the king and the cardinal devised a plan for erecting colleges, and promoting learning, by suppressing monasteries, and using for such purpose the money invested in them.* The first bull for carrying this purpose into effect was obtained from Pope Clement, in 1524. The reader will easily believe that whatever was done in this way to reform religion, must have been incidental and unintended, or it would not have been forwarded by a bull from the pope. Cardinal Wolsey wished

* Historians also relate that the king was expecting a war with France, and lacking the funds to make preparations for it, he wished to make the money thus raised contribute something to this end.—*Burnet's Hist. Ref.*, vol i., pp. 305, 306.

to make a *display;* and to do this, he could think of no better way than to convert monasteries "into bishoprics, cathedrals, collegiate churches, and colleges." Thus God made use of his pride to destroy that sink of iniquity, the monastic system, as he afterwards did of Henry's lust to break the civil chain which the pope had bound around the English nation.

But my business is chiefly with events that transpired in the progress of the reformation which was effected, not by the *aid* of the pope's bulls, but in *spite* of them. And here, while I find reforms occurring, great and glorious, and such as have been lifting the English nation into a higher and higher eminence, even to the present hour, I find them, as a general rule, only following in the train of other and more absorbing interests, and creeping into existence as it were by stealth, or at most by accident. This statement, as I intimated in the outset, I desire to make with some measure of abatement,—applying it, not to every specific fact, but only to the general current of events which characterized the period of which I speak.

And here I would invite attention particularly to an abatement of the persecution of protestants which occurred at one time during the controversy between Henry and the pope. It arose from no desire to extend the rights of conscience and the liberty of thinking and acting freely in religion,—rights and liberties which are inherent in the very first principles of a protestant faith,—but it had its origin in the selfish ambition to force the pope into a compliance with Henry's wishes. It is well known that at that day the Romish church relied almost wholly upon force to propagate its faith and to suppress alleged heresy. Henry caused the withdrawal of all forcible persecution of the preachers of Luther's doctrines, and held

the fact up before the pope as a threat, that heresy would be permitted to spread over the land, unless his demands should be acceded to.* And when More came into favor, who was a bigoted persecutor by nature, and persuaded the king that a vigorous support of the church would be more likely to bring the pope to a compliance, a proclamation against the heretics was issued, and a rigorous array of force was again put in motion to exterminate false doctrine.

The translation of the Scriptures into English, one of the most important movements in Henry's time, was wholly accidental, in the sense in which we are using the term in this discussion. When a translation was proposed, great opposition, of course, was made to it, and nothing seems to have prevailed with the king, except the argument that a flattering of the people, by entrusting them with the Bible, would make his own supremacy acceptable, while that of the pope would become odious by the remembrance that he had kept them in darkness. He was assured, moreover, that, as the Scriptures recognized a kingly head of the church, rather than a papal, a general reading of them would establish his claims among the people, and overthrow those of the pontiff.† It was not, therefore, any love for the Scriptures, or any desire that the people should become enlightened by them, which led the king to consent to their translation,—for he had utterly refused to give his consent on a previous occasion; but it was his jealousy of the pope's influence with the people.

I may refer also to some modifications in religious matters, made in 1543. "The king," says Burnet,‡ "was now entering upon a war; so it seemed reason-

* Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. i., p. 260. † Ibid., vol. i., p. 315.
‡ Ibid., vol. i., p. 516.

able to qualify the severity of the late acts about religion, that all might be quiet at home."

Facts like these might be multiplied to a great extent; for a careful analysis of the historical records which relate to this reformation, will show that nearly every specific reform grew out of, and was modified by, considerations of state policy.* This is not the branch of my subject, however, to which I am chiefly anxious to draw attention; and, having opened it, I leave it to be enlarged upon by others, or possibly by myself hereafter.

Thus was the progress of the reformation, or its outward acknowledgment by the nation, made dependent on the worldly aims of a wicked and ambitious king. Henry had wrested an ecclesiastical supremacy from the Roman pontiff, only to retain it in his own hands. He had denied that the pope was the head of the church, only that he might proclaim himself its head.† Henry had no more thought of

* Burnet, in the preface to his valuable History of the Reformation, speaking of the advances made in the reformation during Henry's reign, says, "There was still an alloy of other corruptions, embarrassing the purity of the faith. And, indeed, *in the whole progress of these changes*, the king's design seems to have been to terrify the court of Rome, *and cudgel the pope into a compliance with what he desired*."

† The session of parliament held in 1534, enacted "That the king was supreme head in earth of the Church of England, which was to be annexed to his other titles; it was also enacted that *the king and his heirs and successors should have power to visit and reform all heresies, errors and other abuses*, which in the spiritual jurisdiction ought to be reformed."—*Burnet's Hist. Ref.*, vol. i., p. 256.

The laws and orders issued for the government of the reformed church of England, and possessing authority to bind its members, may be arranged under the three heads of legislative, synodical, and mandatory: the first consisting of acts of parliament, the second of decrees of synods confirmed by the sovereign, and the third of the royal mandates. It is evident that in all these cases the assent of the sovereign is indispensable; and in the language of law as well as of prerogative, the royal pleasure has been considered as the source of all church authority; and the different bodies that took part with the crown in the enactment of ecclesiastical laws, were looked upon as

favoring religious freedom of opinion than had the pope. He absolved the people from thinking as the pope thought, but not from thinking as he thought. Hence the vacillating character of the reformation

advisers and counsellors, to be employed in their respective capacities according to the discretion of the sovereign. Thus King James I., in his proclamation of October, 1603, respecting the alleged corruptions of the church, says: "We will proceed according to the laws and customs of this realm, by advice of our council, or in our high court of parliament, or by convocation of our clergy, as we shall find reason to lead us." In Sir Edward Coke's Reports, it is stated, "Albeit the kings of England derived their ecclesiastical laws from others, yet so many as were proved, approved, and allowed here, by and with a general consent, are aptly and rightly called the king's ecclesiastical laws of England:" and the twelve judges declared, in the year 1604, that "the king, without parliament, might make orders and constitutions for the government of the clergy, and might deprive them, if they obeyed not."

The same fact is expressed by Archbishop Wake, in the following manner: "I say it is in the power of the prince to make laws in matters ecclesiastical: and for the doing of this he may advise with his clergy, and follow their counsel, so far as he approves of it. Thus Charles the emperor made up his capitular; and thus any other sovereign prince may take the canons of the church, and form them in such wise into an ecclesiastical law, as he thinks will be most for the honor of God and the good of his people." * * * *

The supremacy of the sovereign rests mainly upon the statute (1 Eliz., c. 1) which "restored to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolished all foreign powers repugnant to the same." By that statute it is enacted, that "such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities and preëminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority have heretofore been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall forever be united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm." By another statute of the same period, (1 Eliz., c. 2, § 26,) the sovereign was empowered, with the advice of commissioners, or of the metropolitan, to ordain additional rites and ceremonies, to be of equal force and authority with those already ordained by act of parliament.

It would appear from the principal act of Queen Mary, and the statutes repealed by it, that the pope's jurisdiction in England was comprised under the five following heads: 1. He was acknowledged as chief bishop of the Christian church, with authority to reform and redress heresies, errors, and abuses in the same. 2. To him belonged the institution or confirmation of bishops elect. 3. He could grant to clergymen licenses of non-residence, and permission to hold more

from the beginning to the end. It was in great part dependent on the caprice of the sovereign. During Henry's life, it went forward or backward just as his whims or his ambition led him to favor or oppose it.

than one benefice. 4. He dispensed in the canonical impediments of matrimony. 5. He received appeals from the spiritual courts. So that the supremacy of the crown in this respect may be summed up in the words of Hooker, after the following manner: "There is required an universal power which reacheth over all, importing supreme authority of government over all courts, all judges, all causes; the operation of which power is as well to strengthen, maintain, and uphold particular jurisdictions, which haply might else be of small effect, as also to remedy that which they are not able to help, and to redress that wherein they at any time do otherwise than they ought to do. This power being some time in the Bishop of Rome, who, by sinister practices, had drawn it into his hands, was for just considerations by public consent annexed unto the king's royal seat and crown. * * * * Our laws have provided that the king's superëminent authority and power shall serve: as, namely, when the whole ecclesiastical state, or the principal persons therein, do need visitation and reformation: when in any part of the church, errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, enormities, are grown which men, in their several jurisdictions, either do not or cannot help: whatsoever any spiritual authority or power, (such as legates from the see of Rome did sometimes exercise,) hath done or might heretofore have done for the remedy of those evils in lawful sort, (that is to say, without the violation of the law of God or nature in the deed done,) as much in every degree our laws have fully granted that the king forever may do, not only by setting ecclesiastical synods on work that the thing may be their act and the king their motion unto it, but by commissioners few or many, who, having the king's letters patents, may in the virtue thereof execute the premises as agents in the right, not of their own peculiar and ordinary, but of his superëminent power."

Large, however, as is the field allowed by the statute for the exercise of the supremacy, its boundary is made more indistinct, and at last vanishes in the distance, when we include within it the further range that was claimed and recognized at different periods of our history, under the title of the king's prerogative. It was decided, in the well-known case of Cawdry, that the act of supremacy (1 Eliz., c. 1) "was not a statute introductory of a new law, but declaratory of the old;" and that if it had never been enacted, "the king or queen of England might make such a commission as is there provided, by the ancient prerogative and law of England." So that, independently of the powers acknowledged in the statute, there was yet in reserve within the capacious bosom of the common law, an undefined authority, which being similar in its character, might also be equal in its amount, to the omnipotence of Rome.—*Cardwell's Annals Ch. of Eng.*, vol. i., pp. 5—11.

The church had cut itself off from the possibility of a thorough and steadily progressive reformation, by vesting the papal authority in the king, and by thus retaining an arbitrary earthly head. The religious rights of the people, long unrighteously merged in the pope, were not, when wrested away from him, distributed to their rightful possessors. At one time, Henry's interest required him to favor a specific reform, and again to oppose and repress another. And in subsequent reigns, the reformation was carried rapidly forward, and again well nigh destroyed by the elevation to the throne first of a protestant, then of a papist. In one period, Bibles were distributed, communion tables introduced, pictures taken down from the walls of churches, and a free interchange and expression of religious opinion everywhere tolerated. In another, Bibles contribute to papal bonfires, altars for celebrating the mass are set up, pictures are again worshipped, martyrs alone utter their opinions freely, and the fires of the stake afford the only light in the kingdom. The chief difficulty lay in the fact that, in the beginning, the king took the management of the reformation into his own hands, and it was ever after considered a matter for the sovereign to manage, instead of the divines of the church.* Hence it became

* These statements are strikingly illustrated in the failure of the attempt made by Melancthon and others on the continent, and Cranmer and his associates in England, to strengthen the protestant interest by uniting the German and English reformers in a joint confession of faith. The plan originated with Melancthon, and was warmly seconded by Cranmer. After considerable correspondence on the subject, Melancthon, in 1534, was invited into England for the purposes of assisting to conclude a treaty of alliance, and to prepare a joint confession of faith. He did not comply with the invitation, but he labored to prepare the way for effecting the proposed measures; and in 1538, a mission, consisting of three distinguished gentlemen, was sent to England for the purposes just named. Cranmer, and other bishops and divines, having been directed to confer with them, the Augsburg confession was selected

a question of state policy,* rather than one of religious reform. The power, wealth, and aggrandizement of the nation was the leading aim, and the renovation and purity of the church were secondary objects. The facts of history, and the necessities of the case, speak the same general truth, and declare alike the subserviency of the religious reformation to the national glory. The English nation never committed a sadder or more fatal mistake, than when its high priests celebrated the banns of marriage between the church and the state. This is the fundamental error which underlies all their subsequent mistakes—the marriage which has given to the world a most unnatural progeny in every generation since. For when such a union is once completed, the church must become the mere handmaid of the state—its servant, not its mistress. The pride of the state and the humility of the church concur in giv-

as the ground-work of their proceeding, with the understanding that the articles of faith should first be settled, and then that the abuses of the church should be considered. Having brought the first division of their labor to an amicable issue, the ambassadors urged upon Cranmer the importance of taking up immediately the abuses of the church. Cranmer gave his full consent, but the other bishops declined, on the plea that *the king was about to write on the points in dispute, and it would be improper for them to anticipate him, lest they should express sentiments which his royal highness would not approve.* Thus, a confederacy, which might have resulted in giving to England a more *unequivocal* protestantism, and to the church a protestant league which might before this have driven Romanism from the earth, was prevented. An account of this movement will be found in the fourth vol. of Burnet's History of the Reformation; also, with less fulness, in the first vol. of Strype's Annals Ref.

* Maurice, in his "Kingdom of Christ," a work which combines the tractarian and transcendental theologies, tells occasionally an honest truth, in quite a philosophical way. He says, "While I have maintained that the protestant principles are inseparably connected, and that all are implicitly contained in the first, [justification by faith,] I have hinted also that they presented themselves in quite different aspects and relations to the different reformers. Justification was the central thought in Luther's mind, election in Calvin's, the authority of the Scriptures in Zuingle's, *the authority of sovereigns in all the political patrons of protestantism, and in some of its theological champions,* ESPECIALLY HERE IN ENGLAND."—p. 105.

ing the supremacy to the former. The interests of the state, therefore, must first be looked after; and any reformation in the church can only be allowed when the interests of the state require or tolerate it. It need excite no surprise, therefore, that the reformation was accidental in its whole course. It could not be otherwise. The church's espousal to the state had given her a menial position, and subordinated her interests to those of a higher power. She had permitted herself to be sold into bondage—had entered into the service of a master who would not divide with her the rights of supremacy. She could expect no less than that her claims should be secondary to those of her liege lord.

In expressing these thoughts, of course I shall not be accused of saying or insinuating aught to the discredit of the divines of the English church, whose hearts were in the reformation. Certainly, I cannot be thought to entertain other than feelings of the highest respect for such men as Cranmer, who at the stake voluntarily thrust his right hand into the flame, saying, "That unworthy hand," because it had signed a false declaration of his faith; as Hooper, who died in the flames with the words of the martyr Stephen upon his lips; as Ridley, who said to his fellow-sufferer, "Be of good heart, brother, for God will either assuage the fury of the flame, or enable us to abide it;" as Latimer, who, in like trying circumstances, said—"We shall this day light such a candle in England as I trust by God's grace shall never be put out;"—men of whom the world was not worthy, and to whom God granted, as to Elijah of old, the special favor of being carried to heaven in chariots of fire. These, and numerous others, were among the salt of the earth. They shed a lustre, such as is seldom shed, upon the

christian name. But they were the servants of a mistress who was in bondage. The church, at whose altars they served, had espoused herself to a kingdom which was of this world. They were in heart true to their heavenly King; but the iron will of an earthly master often stopped them in their course, and held back their hands from the work they desired to do.* Our Lord has forewarned his people that they cannot serve two masters; and the experience of these excellent men shows that there was deep philosophy in the remark. They often would do good, but evil—an evil worldly power—was present to restrain and hinder them. The example furnishes a warning to the church never again to link herself to the state, or in any way to form an alliance with the world. She has a Master in heaven, who will not justify her in becoming the servant of another.

* "They [the reformers] had exposed the errors and renounced the jurisdiction of the court of Rome; but the powers it had exercised were transferred, as of necessity, to their sovereign, and no inquiry was made whether some of them were not part of his original prerogative, and others inconsistent with the nature of his office. It appeared as if the Church of England, having drifted away from the shores of the papacy, was treated by the statesmen of these times as a waif or an estray, and claimed, like all other *bona vacantia*, as the *property of the crown*. With respect, then, to the future condition and the positive reformation of the national church, the powers of the reformers were at an end as soon as they had shaken off the tyranny of Rome." — *Cardwell's History of Conferences, and other proceedings connected with the revision of the Book of Common Prayer.*

CHAPTER III.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION INCOMPLETE AS TO DOCTRINES.

It would be saying too much to affirm that the great doctrines of the gospel were not asserted, and strongly set forth, in the preaching and the writings of the reformers of the English communion. In this respect, they were, perhaps, fully as clear and intelligently sound as the reformers on the continent. My charge against them is, not that they did not hold the truth, but that they did not hold it in a state of separation from error. They restored all the truths which the Roman church had lost; but they did not reject all the errors which that wicked communion had introduced. Thus, while they combined in their teachings all the protestant elements of a true gospel, they mingled with them enough of the popish element of a false gospel to neutralize in part their heavenly influences, and to hinder their free and benign action upon the world.

1. My first charge against the English reformers relates to the views held and inculcated respecting the canon of Scripture.* On this point, I shall draw my evidence from but one source, and that of such authority that all will regard it as sufficient. I refer to the first and second books of homilies. Of these books the XXXVth article thus speaks: "The second book of

* It is well known that the Roman church makes the canon of Scriptures consist, not merely of the written word received by protestants, but of a body of written and unwritten tradition also; and that to these combined, it adds the whole of the books called the apocrypha. The written Scriptures, tradition, and the apocrypha, make up the Roman Catholic's scriptural canon.

homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined, under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former book of homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people." To this article the American Episcopal church has added these words: "This article is received in this church, so far as it declares the books of homilies to be an explication of christian doctrine, and instructive in piety and morals."

These books are, therefore, one of the standards of doctrine of highest authority in the Episcopal church. Now listen to the allusions which they make incidentally to passages contained in the *apocrypha*.

"Let us learn also here [in the Book of Wisdom, one of the apocryphal books, vi. 1—3] *by the infallible and undeceivable word of God*," &c., Homilies, 1 B., x. 1, p. 97.* "As the *word of God* testifieth, Wisdom xiv." 2 B., ii. 3, p. 198. "So is the weakness, vileness, and foolishness, in device of the images, (whereby we have dishonored him,) expressed at large in the *Scriptures*, namely, the Psalms, the *book of Wisdom*, the prophet Esaias," &c. 2 B., i. 1, p. 164.

"The same lesson doth *the Holy Ghost* also teach in sundry places of *Scripture*, saying, 'mercifulness and alms-giving,'" &c. Tobit iv., 10. 2 B., xi., 2, p. 346.

The wise preacher, the son of Sirach, confirmeth the same, when he says, "As water quencheth burning

* My first intention was to take some of the passages selected by Mr. Newman in Tract ex.; but discovering a few of his quotations to be incorrect and dishonest, like his explanation of the articles, I threw them aside, and have made my quotations directly from the late American edition of the homilies.

fire," &c. "The rude people, who specially as the *Scripture* teacheth, Wisdom xiii. and xiv., are in danger of superstition and idolatry," &c. 2 B., ii. 3, p. 216. Ecclesiasticus iii. 30.

The homilies also, after quoting these, and some passages from the fathers, add these words,—"Thus we are taught by the *Scriptures* and ancient doctors," &c. 2 B., Hom. ix., p. 322.

Here, in a volume next in authority to the prayer-book, is a very clear and repeated recognition of the apocrypha as a part of the canon of Scripture, a doctrine most thoroughly and perniciously unprotestant.

2. My second charge relates to justification and regeneration. The English reformers connected both with baptism, after the manner of the Roman church. I again sustain my position by quotations from the homilies.

"Our office is, not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly, after that we are *baptized or justified*," &c. 1 B., iii. 3, p. 26.

"The order or decree made by the elders for washing oft-times, which was diligently observed of the Jews; yet tending to superstition, our Saviour Christ altered and changed the same in his church, into a profitable sacrament, the *sacrament of our regeneration or new birth*." 2 B., iv. 2, p. 258.

"We be therefore *washed in our baptism from the filthiness of sin*, that we should live afterwards in the pureness of life." 2 B., xiii. 1, p. 369.

Speaking of the house of God, the homilies say, "The *fountain of our generation* is there presented [ministered] unto us." 2 B., iii., p. 245.

It will not be needful to enter into any labored proof that these passages convey a doctrine which is not protestant. Enough to know that Rome says, speak-

ing of justification, "The instrumental cause is the sacrament of baptism, without which justification comes to none." It admits of no doubt that these reformers believed that regeneration, — inward, spiritual regeneration, not merely sacramental, — is effected in the waters of baptism. They believed that the act of consecrating the water infused it with the Spirit, or endowed it with power to convey the germs or beginnings of spiritual life. This doctrine is abundantly taught in the prayer-book, and in the writings of English divines, as I shall have occasion to show in a subsequent part of this discussion.

3. I charge still further upon the English reformers, that they held not only Romish opinions as to the *nature* and *efficacy* of the sacraments, as shown above, but that their views were indistinct and unsettled as to their *number*. Referring again to the homilies, the reader may find such language as this:

"By holy promises, with calling the name of God to witness, we be made lively members of Christ, when we profess his religion receiving the sacrament of baptism. By like holy promise the *sacrament of matrimony* knitteth man and wife in perpetual love." 1 B., vii. 1, p. 64.

The homilies do indeed contain passages which seem to contradict this clear statement, and to imply that the writers did not hold the Roman doctrine of seven sacraments. Their sentiments respecting the sacraments seem, in fact, to have been confused and obscure. They did not regard matrimony, orders, &c., "*such* sacraments as baptism and the communion are;" yet they viewed them as, to a certain extent, sacramental ordinances. In short, they had retreated about as far from Romanism, in some respects, as the tractarians have from protestantism; and were holding, somewhere between

the two systems, a kind of "sacramental theology," minus a number of the papal adjuncts.

4. The minds of these reformers seem not to have been purged of Roman views of the authority of the ancient church and fathers. Let the homilists utter their sentiments once more.

"Contrary to the which most manifest doctrine of the Scriptures, and contrary to the usage of the primitive church, which was most pure and uncorrupt, and contrary to the *sentences* and *judgments* of the most ancient, learned, and godly doctors of the church." 2 B., ii. 1, p. 158.

"Epiphanius, a bishop and doctor of such antiquity and *authority*." 2 B., ii. 2, p. 174. This short passage gives but a slight idea of the *extravagant* manner in which this homily speaks of Epiphanius. The reader will do well to consult the whole passage.

"It shall be declared, both by God's word, and the *sentences* of the ancient doctors, and judgment of the primitive church," &c. 2 B., ii. 3, p. 193.

"That the law of God is likewise to be *understood* against all our images, as well of Christ as his saints, in temples and churches, appeareth further by the *judgment* of the doctors, and the primitive church." 2 B., ii. 3, p. 197.

"The primitive church *which is specially to be followed*, as most incorrupt and pure. Thus it is declared by God's word, the *sentences* of the doctors, and the judgment of the primitive church." 2 B., ii. 3, p. 199. "Thus you see that the *authority both* of the Scripture, and *also* of Augustine, doth not permit that we should pray unto them." 2 B., vii. 2, p. 290.

To show the unsoundness of these views belongs to another branch of the subject. I therefore pass them here without comment.

These quotations afford a striking comment on a truth which may several times come out in this discussion, namely, that the English reformation, the prayer-book, the homilies, and the teachings of the English divines, are, and have been, remarkable for the mingling of the Roman Catholic and protestant elements.* At almost every point, the glorious truths of the gospel are shining out, and side by side with them are found the traces, and sometimes the body and substance, of Roman error.

The propriety of quoting from the homilies in this chapter will be manifest when it is considered that they were written by Cranmer and Ridley, are reckoned among the symbolical writings of the church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States, and are said by one of our articles of religion to "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine."

* When I had nearly completed the writing of this volume, Isaac Taylor's profound and learned work, entitled "Ancient Christianity," fell into my hands; and as the author is a member of the church of England, I am happy to strengthen the above statement by the following quotation:

"The worship, the sacramental notions, and the feelings of the African church of the times of Cyprian, furnish, as I think, the ideal model which the founders of the English church held in their view. With these notions and practises, which affect the 'offices,' were mingled the very incongruous materials proper to the continental reformation — I mean those energetic, evangelic principles, which gave life to the preaching of Luther and his colleagues. Almost an utter dissimilarity distinguishes the christianity of Luther from that of Cyprian; — and yet ELEMENTS OF BOTH ARE BOUND TOGETHER IN THE ENGLISH PRAYER-BOOK AND HOMILIES!

"From this source have arisen, from time to time, differences which no ingenuity of explanation can ever avail to reconcile, and feuds to which, in the nature of things, no method of pacification can be applied. All may indeed seem to go well during seasons of universal slumber; but at the moment of a revival of religious feeling, from whatever quarter it springs, the old interminable strife wakes up, and threatens an open schism."—*Ancient Christianity*, vol. ii., p. 109.

CHAPTER IV.

THE REFORMATION INCOMPLETE AS TO USAGES.

Numerous passages from the homilies have been produced as documentary evidence that the English reformation was doctrinally incomplete. I now advance another step, and view it as it presents itself in its outward ceremonial.

This reformation was emphatically a gradual work. Begun under accidental circumstances, it had to urge its way through constant embarrassments, and was effected only by a slow and uncertain process. Indeed, it seems to have been gradual intentionally, so far as there was any intention about it. It was gradual intentionally, as I shall have occasion to show in a subsequent chapter, with the view of silencing the objections of those papistically inclined, and of keeping them satisfied with an amount of papal *appearances*, at least, still remaining. It does not appear, however, but that the promoters of it among the clergy hoped that every Romish peculiarity would *ultimately* be removed. But they differed much as to present action in reference to many points. Thus, in the reign of Edward VI., Hooper, one of the most zealous and faithful preachers of the time, and who was burnt in the reign of Mary, was conscientiously opposed to wearing the "popish habits," the surplice included; whereas Cranmer and Ridley were at that time so much set upon their use, that they silenced Hooper, and refused to consecrate him to a bishopric unless he would

use them.* Had he lived a little later, he would have been ranked among the puritans. He was, in fact, the first puritan; that is, he was the first minister in the church of England who advocated an entire *purification* of the church from the errors and *usages* of the Romish communion.

During the reign of Mary, when the Roman faith was restored, many of the bishops and divines fled to the continent to escape the flames of martyrdom. During their absence, they of course cherished the strongest desire to see their native country rid of all the corruptions of popery; and when Elizabeth came to the throne, and the time was approaching for their joyful return to England, those who had taken refuge at Frankfort became extremely anxious as to the course which would be taken at home in regard to "ceremonies;" and on the 3d of January, 1559, they wrote to others of their brethren who had sheltered themselves from the storm at Geneva, for the purpose of having some mutual understanding as to what course they should pursue on this subject when they reached their native home. They said to their brethren, that whatever ceremonies should be retained, they should have no hand in their establishment; they hoped they should not be burthened with them; but if disappointed in this, they thought it best to submit; but they would be ready to join with their brethren in becoming "suitors for the reformation and abolishing of the same." James Pilkington, soon after the learned and zealous bishop of Duresme, was one of the signers of this letter. Strype says,† "And the first bishops that were made, and who were but newly returned out of their

* Warner's Ecclesiastical Hist., vol. ii., p. 280.— Bogue and Bennett's Dissenters.

† Annals of the Ref., vol. i., p. 177.

exiles, as Cox, Grindal, Horne, Sandys, Jewel, Parkhurst, Bentham, upon their first returns, before they entered upon their ministry, *labored all they could against receiving into the church the papistical habits, and that all the ceremonies should be clean laid aside. But they could not obtain it from the queen and parliament.* And the habits were enacted. Then they concerted together what to do, *being in some doubt whether to enter into their functions.*" Strype also says, "As for the other ceremonies used in the Roman church, these our divines could have been contented at this juncture to have been without, observing what jealousies were taken at them; and *that there might not be the least compliance with the popish devotions.* Bishop Jewel, in a letter dated in February, 1559, to Bulinger, said, "The surplice moved weak minds, and that for his part he wished that the very *slightest footsteps of popery* might be taken away, both out of the church, and out of the minds of men. But the queen," he said, "could at that time bear no change in religion."* The excellent archbishop Sandys said in his last will and testament, "I am now, and ever have been, persuaded that some of the rites and ceremonies are not expedient for this church now; but that in the church reformed, and in all this time of the gospel, they may better be disused by little and little than more and more urged."

On the authorities, then, of bishops Jewel, Pilkington, Cox, Grindal, Horne, Sandys, Parkhurst and Bentham, I assert, that, in the matter of ceremonies, the reformation was not completed; for the surplice, which Jewel ranks among the "footsteps of popery;" the habits, the surplice included, which Strype, the emi-

* Annals of the Ref., vol. i., p. 177.

nent historian, calls the "papistical habits;" and a variety of other ceremonies which they all "labored all they could" to have "clean laid aside," were retained. All these ceremonies, too, would have been removed but for the queen, who, Jewel said, could bear no change in religion beyond that which was made. And the question fairly arises here, who was right, the half papist queen Elizabeth, or the reformed bishops just named? The queen said the reformation was carried far enough, that it was completed, and should go no further. The bishops said, the "footsteps of popery" were not blotted out, and that the remains of Romanism *ought* to be "clean laid aside." I do not hesitate to declare for the bishops; though the greater part of my episcopal friends now take sides with the queen, and think some portion of the "papistical habits" the most becoming in the world. I am aware that queen Elizabeth was very fond of showy things; but I never could learn that she used stronger arguments for retaining a white linen surplice than these eminent divines employed for laying it aside. I shall feel, at all events, when I come, by and by, to urge good philosophical reasons why it should now be abandoned, that I am supported by better authorities than that of a half reformed and tyrannical queen. If these ceremonies ought to be retained, then it was fortunate that the sovereign had been made the head of the church, for it was only in consequence of this that they were saved. Let the lovers of the surplice never forget their obligations to queen Elizabeth, who saved their "papistical habit" from the oblivion into which these eminent bishops would have cast it.*

* The committee of divines appointed in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, to revise the prayer-book, presented a new book to Sir William Cecil, accompanied with a paper by Guest, a distinguished

Notwithstanding that these divines were foiled in their attempt to make a "clean" sweep of the ceremonies, they still decided to "enter into their functions," hoping that the time would come when a more thoroughly protestant feeling would prevail with the head of the church, to consent to a removal of the last remains of the "popish devotions." Constant in the discharge of their ministerial duties, they were also busy in urging a further reformation, particularly in regard to "ceremonies;" and three years after their return from abroad, the great convocation of the clergy was called together, in which the articles of religion were adopted, and other matters were debated and arranged. Previous to the meeting of this body, the archbishop of Canterbury prepared, or procured to be prepared, a paper, embracing such matters as were expected to come before the convocation. The matter embraced in this paper related to "doctrines," "rites," and "ecclesiastical laws and discipline." Under the head of rites, the paper proposed that "the use of vestments, copes and surplices, be from henceforth taken away." When the matter of rites and ceremonies came before the convocation, bishop Sandys brought in a paper, wherein he advised that her majesty be moved that "the collect

divine, setting forth the reasons which had induced him to assent to several of the alterations. A distinguished writer says:

"But the fact of greatest interest which we learn from this document is, that after the divines had completed their work, and delivered it to Sir W. Cecil, some important changes were still made, before the book received the sanction of the legislature. It is supposed by some that these changes were introduced during its progress through the legislature; *but it is more probable, from the known sentiments and subsequent conduct of the queen, that they were inserted previously by herself and her council.* This, however, is certain, that the committee of divines disapproved of any distinction as to the use of vestments, between the celebration of the communion and the other services of the church; and by a still bolder act of concession, left it to every man's choice to communicate either standing or kneeling: both these changes, however, were withdrawn before the book was eventually published."—*Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences,* pp. 21, 22.

for crossing the infant in the forehead may be blotted out. As it seems very *superstitious*, so it is not needful." There was put in also a request from certain members of the lower house, signed by thirty-three in number, to the effect, among other things, that the cross in baptism might be laid aside; that the use of copes and surplices might be taken away; that all saints' and holy-days, except such as relate to Christ, be rejected, as *tending to superstition*, &c. These articles were earnestly debated, and when passed upon, fifty-eight voted for them, and fifty-nine against them. Of those *present*, however, *forty-three* voted *for* the propositions, and *thirty-five* against them. They were lost by *proxy* votes. The main objection urged against them was, that they were contrary to the book of common prayer, which had been settled by act of parliament.* It is plain that the opinion of the convocation was against the usages which these articles aimed to abolish; but they were enacted by parliament, and the queen was known to be averse to their removal; and so the "ceremonies" were saved again by the half-reformed queen. I ask again, who was right, the convocation of the clergy, or the queen? By the decision of this convocation, the church was not fully reformed in the matter of ceremonies.

From this time forward, open remonstrances against the papal ceremonies were greatly increased. Many of the most pious as well as the most learned men in the church became earnest opposers of them, alleging that they were vestiges of the papal system, tending only to the begetting of feelings and sentiments in harmony with a cast-off and rejected religion. Indeed, so *general* was the dissatisfaction with them, that the

* Strype's Annals of the Ref., vol. i., pp. 316 — 339. Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. iii., pp. 454 — 5. Warner, vol. ii., p. 429.

London Christian Observer says, (and several histories which I have examined confirm the statement,) a large portion of the preaching clergy *scrupled at the ceremonies*, so that nearly thirty years after the establishment of the reformation, there were only about two thousand preachers for ten thousand parish churches.

The limits assigned to this branch of the subject do not allow of reciting the numerous instances in which a strong expression of opinion against the remains of popery was called forth. It is indeed true that the supporters of them became more and more numerous every year, and more intolerant towards their opposers. The attentive student of history may find a reason for this in the patronage and encouragement they received from the sovereigns, who, through several successive reigns, were the firm supporters of the "ceremonies."

Passing over other attempts to reform the prayer-book, made by the best men in the establishment, I will merely invite the reader's attention to a movement in the reign of William and Mary, to effect a comprehension* with the nonconformists. Several of the most eminent bishops, lamenting the folly which defeated the attempted comprehension at the Savoy conference, in 1662, were desirous, as a protestant king had at length come to the throne, to make one more effort, hoping to repair, in some measure, the mischiefs of a former obstinate clinging to Romish ceremonials. The king, therefore, by their advice, summoned a convocation of the clergy, and appointed a commission of ten bishops and twenty other divines† to prepare mat-

* This is a term which has been usually employed to signify such alterations in the prayer-book as would make it acceptable to the dissenters, and bring them into the establishment.

† The ten bishops were, Lamplugh, archbishop of York, Compton, Mew, Lloyd, Sprat, Smith, Trelawly, Burnet, Humphreys and Strat-

ters to be laid before them. The commission met at the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster, on the 10th of October, 1689. In his memoir of archbishop Sancroft, Dr. D'Oyly says of this project:

"In consequence of this temper now displayed by the protestant dissenters, [a mild and conciliating temper,] archbishop Sancroft was induced to set on foot a scheme of comprehension, in which his purpose seems to have been, to *make such alterations in the liturgy*, and in the discipline of the church, in points not deemed of essential and primary importance, as might prove the means, through corresponding concessions on the part of the more moderate dissenters, of admitting them within its pale."

It will not be necessary to recite the particular doings of the commission. Enough to say that *six hundred alterations* were proposed by them to be laid before the convocation for its sanction and adoption. They were brought before the convocation, but by the appointment of Dr. Jane as prolocutor in the lower house, instead of Dr. Tillotson, the whole scheme was blasted.

Burnet,* writing in the beginning of the next century, and referring to this convocation, says, "Our worship is the perfectest composition of devotion that we find in any church, ancient or modern: yet *the corrections that were agreed to, by a deputation of bishops and divines in the year* 1689, *would make the whole frame of our liturgy still more perfect;* and will, I hope, at some time or other, be better entertained than

ford, whose dioceses were London, Winchester, St. Asaph, Rochester, Carlisle, Exeter, Salisbury, Bangor and Chester. The twenty divines were, Stillingfleet, Patrick, Tillotson, Meggot, Sharp, Kidder, Aldridge, Jane, Hall, Beaumont, Montague, Goodman, Beveridge, Battely, Alston, Tennison, Scott, Fowler, Grove, Williams.

* Hist. of His Own Times, vol. ii., p. 634.

they were then. I am persuaded they are such as would bring in the much greater part of the dissenters to the communion of the church, *and are in themselves desirable, though there were not a dissenter in the nation.*"

Thus I have adduced the testimony of the most eminent bishops and divines of the English church, at two different periods of its history, that the usages of the church are not "sufficiently purged;" that they need further corrections in order to remove just and reasonable grounds of complaint. At the first attempt, their removal was prevented by the secular head of the church; at the second, by high church bishops and priests, and an unyielding house of commons. A large portion of the purest and best divines along the whole track of time from one period to the other, were opposed to them, and desired their removal. It may be fairly assumed, therefore, that, in the matter of ceremonies, the reformation was not completed, the English church itself being judge.

CHAPTER V.

THE REFORMATION INCOMPLETE AS TO THE NUMBERS REFORMED.

THE English church never presented the glorious spectacle of the *whole* body of its clergy and people devoted to the principles of a pure protestant faith.*

* The particulars are, of course, included in a general declaration that this reformation was never completed. The general declaration can be fully sustained by a reference to Burnet. I quote this writer because he is a *standard* authority in our denomination, both among high and low churchmen. In the preface to his second volume of Hist. Ref., he says:

"This whole objection, when all acknowledged, as the greatest part of it cannot be denied, amounts, indeed, to this, that *our reformation has not yet arrived at that full perfection that is to be desired.*" * * *

"The worst that can be said of all these abuses is, that *they are relics of popery*, and we owe it to the unhappy contests among ourselves that a *due correction has not yet been given to them.*" * * * *

"I have now examined all the prejudices that either occur to my thoughts, or that I have met with in books or discourses against our reformation; and I hope, upon a free inquiry into them, it will be found that some of them are of no force at all, and that the others, *which are better grounded*, can amount to no more than this, that things were not managed with that care, *or brought to that perfection*, that were to be desired; so that all the use we ought to make of these objections, is to be directed by them to do those things which may *complete* and adorn that work, which was managed by men subject to infirmities, who neither could see everything, nor were able to accomplish all they had projected, and saw fit to be done." * * * "To speak freely, I make no doubt but if the reformation had been longer a hatching under the heat of persecution, it had come forth *perfecter* than it was."

These are honest and honorable concessions. They accord so entirely with the facts of the case, that no sincere inquirer after truth can fairly come to any other conclusion. They breathe a spirit of thankfulness for what had been accomplished, and a desire that the work might be completed. Attributing to the men who promoted the reformation the common frailties of our nature, and recognizing the difficulties which stood in their way — difficulties which I have spoken of in a previous chapter — they indulge in no boastings which truth will not warrant. I commend them to the consideration of those who are in the habit of stating the results of this reformation in a different way. These statements are vital to the subject in hand, and they

It would be much nearer the truth, however, to assert the opposite of this of the people, than to affirm it of the clergy. The English *people* have generally, since the reformation, been pretty thoroughly protestant—so much so that when any portion of them have been perverted by a strong popish leaning among the clergy, it has been only the few, and they among the wealthy and aristocratic. The body of the middling and lower classes of the nation has been struck through and through with protestant principles. Hence the discontents, the murmurings, the secessions, which have characterized the periods most signalized by a tendency to Roman doctrines. The people have been reached and influenced less than the clergy, by considerations of state policy. With them, religion has been more a domestic and fireside matter; and they have heartily embraced that which accords best with their common-sense views of the truth as revealed in the word of God. The clergy have been, to some extent, under less favorable influences. By making the ritual of the church a subject of earnest *study*, the seeds of Romanism there remaining have always to some extent developed themselves. It would be strange were it otherwise; for if, with them, the reformation of religion was necessarily a matter of expediency to some extent, and was not, as we have shown, fully carried through, it would be marvellous if the traces of the ancient corruptions did not mar the theology of at least some of them. Such we find to be the case, as I shall now attempt to prove.

There is a difference between the theology of Rome and the government of Rome. Its government may be

must either be admitted, or the authority of Burnet as a historian be invalidated.

See also Warner's Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 317.

expressed in one word — despotism; its theology in another — superstition. In the order of their birth into the world, the theology of Rome was, by a philosophical necessity, before its government. The mind of the people had to be degraded by superstition, before it would bow itself to receive the burdens of a religious despotism. The papal despotism is, therefore, the offspring of the papal corruptions. The latter constitute the root; the former is the branch. Luther, when he began his reformation, made his first attack upon the *theology* of Rome; and when, axe in hand, he had gone round the tree, and with his strong Saxon arm severed the roots, the whole fell together; and when the large sacramental root which he cut only half through was afterwards broken asunder, the whole perished together. The English reformers began with the *government* of Rome; and having lopped off the top of the tree, were obliged afterwards to dig the tangled roots from the ground, or to satisfy themselves with making an annual business of whipping down the sprouts which should spring up. For the reasons stated in a previous chapter, they did not make thorough work in extracting the roots; — especially those sacramental roots which had gone the deepest into the soil. These have, at different periods, sent out their filaments, producing reserve in preaching the doctrine of the atonement, tradition, undue exaltation of the church and of ceremonies, prayers for the dead, the use of pictures, &c. The most prominent errors retained by our reformers related to the sacraments. Upon these, in truth, they appear to have been most deeply in error. *Here*, nearly *all* the *early* English reformers were more or less defective, and *many* of the divines in every subsequent period.

The reader's attention is first invited to the opin-

ions of Cranmer. Of the sacraments, he speaks thus:

"And for this cause, Christ ordained baptism in water, that, *as sure as we see, feel, and touch, water, with our bodies*, and be washed with water, so assuredly ought we to believe, when we be baptized, that Christ is verily present with us, *and that by him we be newly born again spiritually, and washed* from *our sins, and grafted into the stock of Christ's own body.* * * * * In like manner, Christ ordained the sacrament of his body and blood, in bread and wine, to preach unto us that, *as our bodies be fed, nourished, and preserved with meat and drink, so* (*as touching our spiritual life towards God*) *we be fed, nourished, and preserved, by the body and blood of our Saviour Christ.*"*

This same leading reformer also says—

"And when you say, that, *in baptism, we receive the Spirit of Christ*, and *in the sacrament of his body, we receive his very flesh and blood*, this your saying is no small derogation to baptism; wherein we receive not only the Spirit of Christ, but *also Christ himself, whole, body and soul, manhood and Godhead, unto everlasting life.* For St. Paul saith, as many as be baptized in Christ, put Christ upon them. Nevertheless, this is in divers respects; for in baptism, it is done in respect of regeneration, and in the holy communion, in respect of nourishment and sustentation."†

It is common now-a-days, to interpret the word regeneration, which occurs in the baptismal service of our church, as referring, not to a spiritual, but to an ecclesiastical change; not to the renovation of the soul, but to a mere outward transfer from the world to the

* Cranmer's Remains, pp. 302, 303.
† Wordsworth's Life of Latimer, iii., 238.

church. The above quotation shows this to be a very different view from the one held by Cranmer. The *receiving* the *Spirit of Christ*, the *blood of Christ*, nay, *Christ himself*, *body and soul*, *manhood and Godhead*, is quite another affair from a mere changing of one's external relations.

Hear now what Ridley says.

"As the body is nourished by the bread and wine, at the communion, and the soul by grace and Spirit, *with the body of Christ;* even so in baptism, the body is washed with the visible water, and *the soul cleansed by the invisible Holy Ghost.*" *

This, too, is very different doctrine from that which makes baptismal regeneration consist merely in the outward change. The same reformer says again—

"Both you and I agree in this, that in the sacrament is the very *true* and *natural body and blood of Christ*, even *that which was born of the Virgin Mary*, which ascended into heaven, which sits on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead, only we differ *in mode*, in the way and manner of the being. We confess all one thing to be in the sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I confess Christ's *natural body* to be in the sacrament by Spirit and grace, &c. You [Romanists] make a grosser kind of being, enclosing a natural body under the shape and form of bread and wine." †

This passage brings to light a fact which I shall have occasion to prove at large when I come to treat of the sacraments, namely, that the formularies of our church inculcate, and that many of the English divines teach, *a spiritual change in the elements*, and a spirit-

* Cranmer's Remains, iii., 65. † Ridley's Remains, p. 274.

ual presence *in the elements*, in contradistinction to the Roman doctrine of a *carnal* change and a *carnal* presence; the only difference being that the one believes the bread and wine changed into the carnal body and blood of Christ, and the other into his spiritual body and blood — both regarding the change alike *real.*

Look next at the words of Latimer:

"Like as Christ was born in rags, so the conversion of the whole world is by rags, by things which are most vile in this world. For what is so common as water? Every foul ditch is full of it; yet *we wash out remission of our sins by baptism;* for, like as he was found in rags, so *we must find him by baptism.*" *

In regard to baptism, bishop Jeremy Taylor says:

"In baptism, all our sins are pardoned. According to the words of the prophet: 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness.' The catechumen descends into the font a sinner, he arises purified; he goes down the son of death, he comes up the son of the resurrection; he enters in the son of folly and prevarication, he returns the son of reconciliation; he stoops down the child of wrath, and ascends the heir of mercy; he was the child of the devil, and now he is the servant of the Son of God." * * * "Baptism is *aneklogistos aphesis amartion*, — an entire full forgiveness of sins; so that they shall never be called again to scrutiny."

"Baptism does not only pardon our sins, but puts us into a state of pardon for the time to come. * * * Baptism hath influence into the pardon of all our sins, committed in all the days of our folly and infirmity; and so long as we have not been baptized, so long we are out of the state of pardon." †

* Latimer's Sermons, ii., 347 † Works, vol. ii., pp. 243 — 247.

The reader will please next to consider the language of the "judicious" Hooker.

"The eucharist is not a bare sign or figure only. These *holy mysteries*, received in due manner, do instrumentally, both *make us partakers of that body and blood which were given for the life of the world;* and, besides, also impart unto us, even *in true and real*, though mystical manner, the very *person of our Lord himself*, whole, perfect and entire."*

In another place, the same eminent divine uses this strong language:

"The very letter of the words of Christ giveth plain security, that these mysteries do as nails fasten us to His very cross, that by them we draw out as touching efficacy, force and virtue, even the blood of His gored side; in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, our hunger is satisfied, and our thirst forever quenched; they are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and unheard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of the Paschal Lamb, and made joyful in the strength of this new wine; this *bread hath in it* more than the substance which our eyes behold; this *cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare of soul and body*, in that it serveth as well for a *medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins*, as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving: with touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief, it truly conformeth us to the image of Jesus Christ; *what these elements are in themselves* it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ. His promise in witness hereof sufficeth; His word He know-

* Ecclesiastical Polity, v. lxvii., 8.

eth which way to accomplish; why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, O my God, Thou art true, O my soul, thou art happy!" *

Equally, and, if possible, more extravagant are this writer's views of the powers of the christian ministry.

"In that they are Christ's ambassadors and His laborers, who should give them their commission, but He whose most inward affairs they manage? Is not God alone the Father of spirits? Are not souls the purchase of Jesus Christ? What angels in heaven could have said to man, as our Lord did unto St. Peter, 'Feed my sheep,—preach—baptize—do this in remembrance of me. Whose sins ye retain, they are retained; and their offences in heaven pardoned, whose faults you shall on earth forgive?' What think we? Are these terrestrial sounds, or else are they voices uttered out of the clouds above? The power of the ministry of God translateth out of darkness into glory; it raiseth man from the earth, and bringeth God himself from heaven; *by blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible graces; it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; it hath to dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of the world, and the blood which was poured out to redeem souls; when it poureth maledictions upon the heads of the wicked, they perish; when it revoketh the same, they revive.* O wretched blindness! if we admire not so great power; more wretched, if we consider it aright, and, notwithstanding, imagine that any but God can bestow it! To whom Christ hath imparted power, both over that mystical body, which is the society of souls, and over that natural, which is Himself; for the knitting of both in one, (a work

* Ecc. Pol., book v., c. 67.

which antiquity doth call the making of Christ's body,) the same power is in such not amiss both termed a kind of mark or character, and acknowledged to be indelible."*

I quote thus largely from this author, because he is the representative of a large *class*, and is held in high repute. The work from which we quote has the recommendation of the house of bishops, and belongs to the course of study which every candidate for the ministry in our church is required to pursue.

I subjoin a few quotations from English divines on other topics.

Respecting the number of the sacraments, bishop Taylor says:

"It is none of the doctrine of the church of England, that there are two sacraments only; but that those rituals commanded in scripture, which the ecclesiastical use calls sacraments (by a word of art) two only are generally necessary to salvation."

Mr. Palmer also quotes archbishop Secker to the same effect.

Bishop Overall, one of the translators of our Bible, and the author of the latter part of our church catechism, in his comment on the communion service in the first prayer-book of Edward VI., thus advances a doctrine which looks very much like the popish sacrifice of the mass:

"'*We and all thy whole church.*' This is a plain oblation of CHRIST's death once offered, and a representative sacrifice of it for the sins and for the benefit of the whole world, of the whole church; that both those which are here on earth, and those which rest in the sleep of peace, being departed in the faith of Christ,

* Ecclesiastical Pol., v. lxxvii., 1, 2.

may find the effect and virtue of it. And if the authority of the ancient church may prevail with us, as it ought to do, there is nothing more manifest than that it always taught as much. * * * And in this sense, it is not only an eucharistical, but a *propitiatory sacrifice;* and to prove it a sacrifice propitiatory, always so acknowledged by the ancient church, there can be no better argument than that it was offered up, not only for the living but for the dead, and for those that were absent, for them that travelled, for Jews, for heretics, &c., who could have no other benefit of it, but as it was a propitiatory sacrifice; and that they did thus offer it, read a whole army of fathers. Nos autem ita comparati sumus ut cum tasse multis et magnis authoribus errare malimus quam cum Puritanis verum dicere. Not that it makes any propitiation as that of the cross did, but only that it obtains and brings into act that propitiation which was once made by Christ."

Bishop Cosins thus speaks of prayers for the dead:

"Our church agrees with the church of Rome in giving thanks to God for them that are departed out of this life in the true faith of Christ's catholic church, and in praying to God that they may have a joyful resurrection, and a perfect consummation of bliss, both in their bodies and souls in his eternal kingdom."

It was and is the opinion of a large class of English divines, that the sentence before a prayer in the communion service, "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's church militant," is intended to include that portion of the church now in the unseen world, as well as that on earth, and hence that that prayer is intended to be offered for the departed saints as well as for the living. Through the influence of Bucer, and other foreign reformers, the words "here on earth" were

inserted after the adjective militant. Our American prayer-book has been made more popish than the English, by the fathers of our church restoring it to the ancient phraseology. There is no doubt that, in doing so, they have made it conform to the opinions of the great body of high church English divines,—especially such men as Andrewes, Overall, Bull, Hammond, Thorndike, Leslie, and many others.

So numerous are the authorities I might cite to strengthen the position in hand, that the chief difficulty lies in knowing where to stop. Enough, however, is before the reader, to show that a *portion* of the English clergy were never reached and influenced by an *unalloyed* protestant faith. Some of the persons spoken of were never protestants in any just sense; others of them were—such as Cranmer, Jewel, &c., though on some points confused and defective.

CHAPTER VI.

RESULTS OF AN UNFINISHED REFORMATION.

Many persons have the impression that the strong tendency towards Romanism exhibited at the present time in the English and American Episcopal churches, under the form of what is called tractarianism or Puseyism, is altogether a new thing; that the English church, after its reformation was established, continued through successive generations to be swayed by protestant principles only; and that in these latter days, for the first time, a popish spirit, from some unknown, mysterious cause, has entered its sacred temples, perverting its ministers, and spoiling the simplicity of its worship. In scarcely anything could such persons be more mistaken. The present tendency to Romanism, in that church, is not the first, or the second, or the third, it has experienced, as history abundantly testifies. It is not a disease just broken out for the first time, but one which has long been rankling in the system. It is an old chronic difficulty, which has produced gouts, and dyspepsias, and fevers, and chills, and convulsions, through several generations; and these are the *results* of an unfinished reformation.

It is evident that ever since the days of Cranmer and Jewel, the tendency in regard to ceremonialism, and Romish views of the sacraments, the ministry, &c., has been upward. Even in the days of Laud, when there was a strong leaning towards papal corruptions, the body of the clergy and people were far less submissive under the burdens of an exact ceremonialism, than they were even just before the publication of the

Tracts for the Times was begun. The phraseology of our own times has far more of the Romish cast than that of earlier periods. The following passages, found in the London Christian Observer, are a good illustration. Rushworth speaks thus of Laud: — "As Laud approached the *communion table*, he made several lowly bowings; and coming up to the side of *the table* where *the bread and wine* were covered, he bowed seven times." Le Bas, of our own times, says, — "Laud is supposed to have bowed repeatedly towards *the altar*, and to have approached *the sacred elements*, with antic gesticulations."

The forms of speaking here are particularly worthy of notice. At an early period in the history of the English church, the word *altar* was not generally used; in our time, it is common. Then "*bread and wine*" was the more common expression, now it is "*sacred elements*." In the reign of Charles I., a variety of ceremonies, such as signing with the sign of the cross in baptism, bowing at the name of Jesus, kneeling to receive the communion, wearing the surplice, and a variety of other things, occasioned great discontents, murmurings, protestations, and finally even the overthrow of the government and the church, the triumph of presbytery over episcopacy, and of the directory over the prayer-book. In our times, these observances, — sorry I am to say it, — are all submitted to without a murmur, or, at most, with only here and there an open remonstrant. At every revision of the liturgy, from the reign of Elizabeth to that of Charles II., it was made more popish instead of less. The tendency, then, has been upwards towards a higher and more stringent ritualism. In other words, there has been a Rome-ward movement, gradual and generally almost imperceptible, but still so real as to be capable

of historical demonstration, from the days of Edward VI. In the times of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., the validity of the orders of foreign protestant churches was acknowledged by the great body of English Episcopalians. *Now*, the orders of other churches are declared to be invalid, not by tractarians merely, but by large numbers who call themselves evangelical. There can be no doubt, therefore, that there has been an upward tendency for a long period of time; and that the tractarian movement is only the old tendency a little quickened in its motion.

There have been periods, however, when this movement has been more marked, and when it has accordingly attracted more of the public notice. The reader's attention is invited to two or three of these periods.

In the latter part of the reign of queen Anne, there was a rapid movement towards Rome, not less marked and alarming than the one we are witnessing at the present time. In speaking of this movement, Burnet says:

"Many, who profess great zeal for the legal establishment, yet seem to be set on forming a new scheme, both of religion and government, and are taking the very same methods, only a little diversified, that *have been pursued in popery, to bring the world into a blind dependence upon the clergy*, and to draw the wealth and strength of the nation into their hands.

"The opinion of the sacrament being an expiatory sacrifice, and of the necessity of secret confession and absolution, and of the church's authority acting in an independence on the civil powers, were the foundations of popery, and the seminal principles out of which that mass of corruptions was formed. They have no color for them in the New Testament, nor in

the first ages of christianity, and are directly contrary to all the principles on which the reformation was carried on, and to every step that was made in the whole progress of that work; and yet *these of late have been notions much favored, and written for with much zeal, not to say indecency;* besides a vast number of little superstitious practices, that in some places have grown to great height, so that *we were insensibly going off from the reformation, and framing a new model of a church, totally different from all our former principles.*" * * * * *

"These have been but too visibly the arts of Satan to divide and distract us; and have *oftener than once* brought us near the brink of ruin. God has often rescued us, while the continuance and progress of these evil dispositions have as often made us relapse into a broken and disjointed state."*

Again, "If there is any difference between the present state of things and *that we were in above thirty years ago*, it is that we are now more naked and defenceless, more insensible and stupid, and much more depraved in all respects, than we were then. We are sunk in our learning, vitiated in principle; tainted, some with atheism, others with *superstition*, both which, though by different ways, *prepare us for popery*. Our old breaches are not healed, and new ones, not known in former times, are raised and fermented with much industry and great art, as well as much heat; *many are barefacedly going back to that misery from which God by such a mighty hand rescued us.*" * * * * *

"The indispensable necessity of the priesthood to all sacred functions, is carried in the point of baptism fur-

* Preface to third volume Hist. Ref.

ther than popery. Their devotions are openly recommended, and *a union with the Gallican church has been impudently proposed;* the reformation and the reformers are by many daily vilified."*

Such is the sad account which Burnet gives of the state of things during the first years of the eighteenth century. Such passages, stumbled upon accidentally, and without connection, would be taken as a description of what is now passing under our own observation. It was just such a movement towards Romanism as that of the present time; characterized by defection in the same particular doctrines, the same deprecation of the reformation and reformers, with the same longing for a reünion with Rome. It was attended, too, by the same alarms and remonstrances on the part of sensible men.

But this is not the only instance in which the church of England has filled the hearts of her true children with grief, by a threatened revolt from the protestant faith. The reader will observe that in the above extracts, Burnet speaks of the state the church of England was then in, as similar, though perhaps worse in some respects, than the one it was in more than thirty years before. He refers to the dark period in the English church's history during the reign of James II., who was during his headship of the church an avowed papist. Of this period, Burnet says,† "In king James' reign, the fear of popery was so strong, *as well as just,* that many, in and about London, began to meet often together, both for devotion, and for their further instruction."

He also says of the preceding reign, that of Charles II., that "The management for popery was visible;"

* Introduction to Hist. Ref., vol. iii.
† Hist. of His Own Times, vol. ii., p. 317.

and in another place, that "the fears of popery, and the progress that atheism was making, *did alarm good and wise men.*"

Before the commonwealth, in the days of archbishop Laud, about 1640, there was still another strong leaning to Romanism. The account of this period I take from Hallam.*

Speaking of the persecutions of the puritans under Laud, this writer says:

"These severe proceedings of the court and hierarchy became more odious on account of their suspected bearing, or at least notorious indulgence, towards popery." * * * * "It was evidently true, *what the nation saw with alarm*, that a proneness to favor the professors of this religion, [the Roman Catholic,] and *to a considerable degree the religion itself*, was at the bottom of a conduct so inconsistent," &c.

Again, after speaking of the effectual way in which the puritans resisted the papal fascinations, he says:

"But far different principles actuated the *prevailing party* in the church of England. A *change had for some years been wrought in its tenets, and still more in its sentiments, which, while it brought the whole body into a sort of approximation to Rome*, made many individuals shoot as it were from their own sphere, on coming within the stronger attraction of another." * * * * "It is notorious that all the innovations of the school of Laud were so many approaches, in the exterior worship of the church, to the Roman model. Pictures were set up or repaired; the communion-table took the name and the position of an altar; it was sometimes made of stone; obeisances were made to it; the crucifix was sometimes placed

* Constitutional Hist. of Eng., vol. ii., pp. 80—102.

upon it; the dress of the officiating priests became more gaudy, churches were consecrated with a strange and mystical pageantry. These petty superstitions, which would of themselves have disgusted a nation accustomed to despise as well as abhor the pompous rites of the Catholics, became more alarming from the evident bias of some leading churchmen to parts of the Romish theology. The doctrine of the real presence, distinguishable only by vagueness of definition from that of the church of Rome, was generally held. Montague, bishop of Chichester, already so conspicuous, and justly reckoned the chief of the Romanizing faction, went a considerable length towards admitting the invocation of saints; prayers for the dead, which lead at once to the tenet of purgatory, were vindicated by many; in fact, there was hardly any distinctive opinion of the church of Rome, which had not its abettors among the bishops, or those who wrote under their patronage. The practice of auricular confession, the suppression of which an aspiring clergy must so deeply regret, was frequently inculcated as a duty. And Laud gave just offence by a public declaration that, in the disposal of benefices, he should, in equal degrees of merit, prefer single before married priests." * * * "It became usual for our churchmen to lament the precipitancy with which the reformation had been conducted, and to inveigh against its principal instruments."*

* The thronged condition of the highway to Rome, exhibited at this period, is well described in the following pointed anecdote:

"A court lady, daughter of the earl of Devonshire, having turned Catholic, was asked by Laud the reason of her conversion. '*'Tis chiefly,*' said she, '*because I hate to travel in a crowd.*' The meaning of this expression being demanded, she replied, '*I perceive your grace and many others are making haste to Rome; and, therefore, in order to prevent my being crowded, I have gone before you.*'—*Hume's Hist. of Eng.*, vol. vii., p. 90.

Here again are the same characteristics which mark the present movements in the church of England, and in the Episcopal church of America—the same leaning to Roman doctrine, the same adoption of superstitious practices, and the same disparagement of the reformation and the reformers.

What else could be anticipated from such a state of things, but that Rome would rejoice, and calculate on large annexations from protestant territory? And such indeed was the fact. So hopeful did she regard the aspect of things in England, that she prevailed upon king Charles (no very difficult task, I apprehend) to receive privately from her court an accredited agent, named Panzani, for the purpose of effecting some incipient reconciliations. During Panzani's stay in England, negotiations were attempted for reconciling the church of England with that of Rome. Windebank, Lord Cottington, and bishop Montague, acted in behalf of the king. The negotiations failed by reason of the stubbornness of the see of Rome in refusing to make any concessions.

Panzani, on his return to Rome, made a report to the pope respecting the state of the Roman Catholic religion in England. From this report, Mr. Charles Butler has published a long and important extract. It speaks of the flourishing state of the Roman Catholic religion in England; says that many, especially among the nobility, maintained such an exterior as not to be known as Romanists; that many others, from apprehensions of losing their property, lived outwardly as protestants, taking the oath of allegiance, and attending protestant churches, who were yet papists in heart. While he was in London, he reports that nearly all the nobility who died, though reported protestants, died as Romanists. He speaks of a great change as apparent in

books; auricular confession as being praised, images as well spoken of, and wishes of reünion as expressed. He says a good deal about the appointment of a Roman Catholic bishop for England. He also mentions a book, written by Sancta Clara, and expresses sorrow at finding it put in the Index Expurgatorius, because the king was pleased with it. The book was an attempt to show the compatibility of the Anglican doctrines with those of the Roman Catholic church.

Thus I have adduced, I believe, sufficient evidence to show that there have been at least *five* distinct periods, including the present, in which a strong and alarming tendency towards the theology and the usages of the papal church has been manifested in the established church of England. And in each case, it has been marked by precisely the same characteristics, and has been developed in the same progressive way and order. First, an increased attention to outward ordinances and ceremonies; then the magnification and lifting up of the sacraments as the chief of these; then a perversion of the *doctrine* of the sacraments; then higher claims in behalf of priestly power and priestly intervention; then the setting up of the absolute authority of the church; and then, as a necessary consequence of this, and as a cap-stone of the whole, the conclusion that there was sin in resisting the authority of the Romish church, and a desire once more to bow the neck and receive her yoke. And the only material difference which can be shown to exist between the state of things in each of these periods and the present, consists in the fact that during the continuance of each of them there was within the bosom of the church a strong and powerful body, consisting of the best divines and a large majority of the laity, who openly alleged that the causes of the difficulty lay in

the remains of popery, not purged out of the liturgy and usages of the church, and who reasoned, protested, expostulated, and in some instances clamored for their removal; whereas, at the present time, the great majority seem to have lost sight of these true sources of the difficulty, and appear so forgetful of the historical facts in the case, that when the old arguments which have been pressed by the wisest men in the church, through all its popish periods, are reässerted, they are seized with horror and amazement, as if some new thing had happened, and an axe were laid at the root of church principles. It will be shown, in a subsequent part of the book, that there have been principles lying at the bottom of the English system, which produced these results, not by accident, but by a philosophical and logical process.

Such, then, have been the results of a reformation not completed. But even these are not the whole of its evil results. Strype* speaks of a "dangerous increase of papists," and revolts to popery which "appeared in the north, and other parts of the realm," only six years after what was called the settling of the reformation, in Elizabeth's reign. In the next reign, also, that of James the First, the tokens of a backward movement were everywhere open to the inspection of vigilant protestant eyes. James was himself at heart two thirds a papist; and in the famous Hampton Court conference, in which he presided, he so far forgot the proper dignity both of a king and of a presiding officer, as to enlist vehemently in the discussion against those who opposed "the ceremonies," which brought some of the popishly-inclined high churchmen upon their knees to thank God for such a king as no nation (so they

* Annals of the Ref., vol. i., p. 550.

asserted) ever before enjoyed. Dr. Barlow, in his report of the king's speech, at the opening of the conference, represents him as saying, "that he had received many complaints, since his first entrance into the kingdom, especially through the dissensions in the church, of many disorders, as he heard, and much disobedience to the laws, *with a great falling away to popery*." *

The truth is, there have *always*, since the days of Edward VI., been Romish affinities and appetences in the English church; but the outward expression of these affinities has of course depended much on the individual character of its secular head. The divines of the church having learned, many of them to their sorrow, and others to their joy, that the sovereign's will must not be resisted, were always slow to attempt any Romish innovations, unless the leanings of the occupants of the throne were such as to encourage them. Hence, in all those reigns from Elizabeth to George I. in which the sovereign exhibited any papal leaning, the natural affinities† of the church immediately came out, and she was seen receding towards a papal bondage; and hence, too, during all those reigns, the high church Romanizers were the strong supporters of the crown, and especially of an *established* religion.

This fact will solve what has been a difficulty to some minds. Many have wondered why the tractarians, or Romanizers of the present day, are so anxious for the overthrow of the establishment; while it is warmly supported by the low churchmen. The difficulty vanishes when it is considered that for some time past the throne has been occupied by *protestants;* and

* Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences, p. 171.

† I do not mean that the English church has always had affinities for the grosser forms of the Roman theology and usage; but only for those elementary principles, out of which, when once embraced, the more abhorrent mysteries of an idolatrous faith are easily evolved.

hence the low churchmen can shelter themselves from the papal storm behind the throne and the establishment, while the tractarians find these to be the chief obstacles in the way of "unprotestantizing" the English church.

Let this fact be a significant warning to the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States, which meets no such formidable obstacle in the way of its Romeward movements. Let it be well considered whether there is anything which *can* arrest it, except a removal of the remains of popery from its prayer-book and homilies. It is a historic *fact*, that the English church, at every period of its papal tendencies, has been prevented from a total relapse to Romanism *only* by the government. What is to prevent the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States from an entire falling away to popery, since no government stretches out an interposing arm? May God enable our church to meet this question speedily, and to answer it faithfully in the light of history.

PART II.

CAUSES WHICH HAVE PREVENTED THE COMPLETION OF THE REFORMATION IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH, AND IN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER I.

TOLERANCE OF ROMISH ERROR.

Errors usually carry errors in their train. A single false step in the beginning frequently prepares the way for a series of false steps. The error already described, of investing the king with the highest ecclesiastical prerogatives, and placing him at the head of the church, drew after it a long succession of embarrassing movements and practical absurdities. The divines of the church were soon compelled to see that nothing gained in the reformation could be looked forward to as absolutely settled; and especially that they could calculate with no certainty upon any advances in future. They might have the clearest views of truth, and the best resolutions to publish it to men; but they could not say with entire confidence, truth is mighty, and *will* prevail; for they had no assurances that, for a single hour, the throne would be occupied by one who would either hold or tolerate protestant principles. They knew that at any moment their own mouths might be stopped, and every truth-telling tongue in the land be silenced. They *felt* themselves fettered and embarrassed at every step, and hedged about with the capricious uncertainties, generally, of the will of a half-reformed sovereign. The reformation which they had

to effect, therefore, became a work to be pushed to its results, through the winding and intricate mazes of an involved and fickle state policy; liable at any moment to be interrupted and crushed with its authors under the massive wheels of government. They were like men digging under an overhanging cliff, and liable to be buried by its sudden descent upon them. Their work, necessarily, therefore, became one, to some extent, of hesitation, of caution. Every stone was moved from its place with due reference to the condition of the massive rocks towering above them. The sovereign himself, who had the whole control of the reformation, was much in the same condition. The country had been overrun with popery. To what extent it had been eradicated from the minds of the people, was not precisely known. He was surrounded by men of every grade of opinion, from the high papist to the high protestant. Romanism was spread, too, over a large part of Europe, and had for ages been so thoroughly mixed with politics, that this reformation, being one for the sovereign to manage, was touched at a thousand points by the machinery of British diplomacy. So that not the divines only, but the king was tempted to move with great caution, and even to treat the partially routed enemy with some consideration. In short, both the sovereign and the divines were led by these causes to manifest more or less of a spirit of compromise with Romanism. The nation had large numbers of Romanists in it, in every condition of life, from the lowest to the highest. It was not for the interest of the sovereign to drive them into an attitude of hostility to the government, and link their power and interest with those of a foreign and hated enemy. There were great numbers of papists, too, who were *partially* convinced of the rottenness of their own sys-

tem, and who were ready to embrace protestant principles *to a certain extent.* It could hardly be expected that a king or queen who looked more to the good of the state than of the church would deem it politic to repel such. It would rather be strange if they did not court and flatter them by generous concessions.

Exactly in harmony with these suggestions of reason, are the facts of history. The following is much to the point:

"King Edward's prayer-book was the first established book of common prayer in England, and *in order to make the transition from the Roman catholic to the protestant religion as moderate as possible, and thus reconcile a great number to the change,* its compilers allowed the word 'Mass' to stand as the title of the communion service."*

A very important concession to Romanists, surely, the expediency of which most *protestants* would deny.

In regard to the subject of compromise, bishop Burnet says:

"There was a great variety of sentiments among our reformers on the point whether it was fit to retain an external face of things near to what had been practised in the times of popery, or not. The doing that, made the people come easily into the more real changes that were made in the doctrines, when they saw the *outward appearances so little altered:* so this method seemed the safer and the readier way to wean the people from the fondness they had for a splendid face of things, by that which was still kept up. But, on the other hand, it was said that *this kept up the inclination in the people to the former practices:* they were by these made to think that the reformed state

* Comparison between the Communion Offices of the Church of England, and the Scottish Episcopal Church, p. 21.

of the church did not differ much from them. And they apprehended, that *this outward resemblance made the old root of popery to live still in their thoughts;* so that, if it made them conform at present more easily to the change that was now made, it would make it still *much the easier for them to fall back to popery.*" *

What else has occasioned the "falling back to popery" at the several periods of which we spoke in the last chapter, but the very cause here assigned as naturally tending to it, namely, the "retaining an external face of things near to what it had been in the times of popery?" But it seems there were two parties, one for retaining this external papal "face of things;" the other, for becoming protestant in appearance as well as fact. It is not difficult to learn which policy triumphed.

Take, for example, the doctrine of the presence in the sacrament of the supper. History is *full* on the point that the English reformers *intended* to leave it so unexplained that papal views, or those amounting to about the same thing, might be held in the bosom of the church. In the liturgy of king Edward, a rubric was placed before the communion service, explaining that by kneeling "no adoration was intended to any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." But in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth, "it was proposed," says Burnet,† "to have the communion book so *contrived* that it might not exclude the belief of the corporal presence: for the chief design of the queen's council was, to unite the nation in one faith; [another evil result of putting the sovereign at the head of the church;] and the greatest part of the nation continued to believe such a presence. *Therefore*, it was recommended to the divines, *to see that there should be no*

* Hist. Ref., vol. iii., pp. 258–9. † Ibid., vol. ii., p. 606.

express definition against it; that it might lie as a speculative opinion, *not determined*, in which every man was left to the freedom of his own mind. *Hereupon* the rubric that explained the reason for kneeling at the sacrament * * *was left out.*" This was afterwards, in 1661, restored, more by accident than by any real wish to suppress the doctrine of the real corporal presence; for it was done just after the Savoy Conference, at the time when the changes were made indicating an advance towards popery. "The papists," says Burnet,* "were highly offended, when such an express declaration was made against the real presence, and the duke told me, that when he asked Shelden how they came to declare against a doctrine, which he had been instructed was the doctrine of the church, Shelden answered, ask Gawden about it, who is a bishop of your own making." The rubric still stands in the English prayer-book, but has been left out of our liturgy in this country,—showing that the old compromise policy was adopted by our church, and that the *improvement* made in the English prayer-book one hundred years after what is called the settling of the reformation, was deemed by the fathers of our church no improvement.

At the same place in his history of the reformation, Burnet assigns the same reason for a change in regard to the sentences used at the distribution of the bread and wine. In king Edward's first liturgy, as it was called, only the words, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c., and "The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c., were used. The most thorough protestants objected to these words, when used in such connection, as fostering the Roman idea of the corporal

* Hist. his Own Times, vol. i., p. 161.

presence; and as the protestant influence was then predominant, these sentences were *struck out* in the second liturgy of Edward, and the words, "Take, eat this in *remembrance* that Christ died for thee," &c., and "Drink this in *remembrance*," &c., — words expressing the true protestant idea, — were substituted for them. But the Romanists being offended at this, the compromise principle was resorted to, and in the first of Elizabeth's reign, the difficulty was settled to the satisfaction of all parties, by restoring the sentences which had been cast away, and retaining those which had been substituted for them. And thus, the sentences which express the Romish idea, and those which represent the protestant doctrine, have stood side by side, or rather one above the other, to the present time. Bishop Brownell, in his commentary on the prayer-book, mentions these changes, but carefully avoids giving the reasons.

Strype relates* that, in 1559, the bishops of the church allowed popish priests, who had been openly such under Mary, to retain their places and officiate as parish ministers, without any renunciation of their errors, or any profession of protestant principles. And this state of things continued for a number of years, though many of these persons were known to favor Romanism secretly, and to do whatever they could to draw their people away from the protestant religion.

The commission appointed by Charles II., 1662, to revise the liturgy, consisted of two classes of persons: the "ministers," who desired alterations and improvements in the common prayer; and the "bishops," who resisted all movements towards such an end. The ministers, in an address to the sovereign, say,

* Annals of the Reformation, vol. i., p. 176.

"We humbly desire that it may be seriously considered, that as our first reformers, out of their great wisdom, *did at that time so compose the liturgy as to win upon the papists, and to draw them into their church communion, by varying as little as they well could from the Romish forms before in use;* so whether in the present constitution, and state of things amongst us, we should not, according to the same rule of prudence and charity, have our liturgy so composed as to gain upon the judgments and affection of all those who in the substantials of the protestant are of the same persuasions with ourselves."*

To this, the "bishops," who were in the same commission, respond in a way which concedes even more than the "ministers" here urge. They say,

"*It was the wisdom of our reformers to draw up such a liturgy as neither Romanist nor protestant could justly except against;* and therefore as the first never charged it with any positive errors, but only the want of something they conceived necessary, so it was never found fault with by those to whom the name of protestants most properly belongs, those that profess the Augustan confession; and for those who unlawfully and sinfully brought it into dislike with some people, to urge the present state of affairs as an argument why the book should be altered, to give them satisfaction, and so that they should take advantage by their own unwarrantable acts, is not reasonable."†

Facts like the above might be multiplied to a considerable extent; but these are sufficient. I will simply add the express declaration of Burnet, that the reformation *was conducted*, to some extent, on this prin-

* Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences, &c., p. 305. Baxter's Life by Sylvester, B. I., P. 2., p. 316.

† Cardwell's Hist. Conferences, &c., p. 338.

ciple; and no man has ever studied both its outward movements and its secret springs more thoroughly than he. He says:

"Many of these things, [that is, ceremonies,] were retained at the reformation, *to draw the people more entirely into it;* who are apt to judge, especially in things of ignorance, by outward appearances more than by the real value of things; so the *preserving an exterior that looked somewhat like what they had been formerly accustomed to, without doubt had a great effect at first on many persons, who, without that, could not have been easily brought over* to adhere to the work.*"†

A strongly presumptive argument in favor of this view might be found in the extent to which this compromise principle prevails in our own church; for it we are distinguished for anything, it is for the assiduity with which we have cherished those principles, and *only* those, which can claim the sanction of an early recognition in what we have so pertinaciously called our *mother* church of England. It will not be worth while, however, to push a merely presumptive argument to any great extent; and I shall only offer one fact.

Some five or six years since, while living in a neighboring town, I undertook to write the principal part of the editorial matter for the Christian Witness. The policy of the Witness had been, up to that time, to say very little about tractarianism, with the general view, I believe, of avoiding all excitement on the subject, and of keeping its readers ignorant of the fact that

* This is precisely like employing heathen rites and ceremonies, in order to bring over heathens to the reception of Christianity. Such a policy may succeed in transferring them from one system to another, but it leaves their hearts and prejudices the same.

† Hist. of his Own Times, vol. ii., p. 636.

there was any such thing in the Episcopal church. Soon after beginning to write for it, I saw and felt deeply the need of some earnest and reiterated protest in its columns on this subject. I began, therefore, and for about two years continued my earnest appeals to the managers of the paper in Boston, to open its columns to a bold and fearless discussion of a subject more fearfully important than almost any other. I was repulsed again and again; was told that such a discussion would disturb the peace of the church; would loosen the attachment of many laymen to it by making them acquainted with a greater amount of mischief in it than they had supposed to exist, — in short, that if the whole subject were let alone, Puseyism would soon die of itself. On the other hand, I urged that the danger was much greater than was generally apprehended; that Puseyism, if let alone, would, instead of dying out, overrun and blight our denomination; that the Witness itself, if it remained silent, would either be swept along into tractarianism, or by-and by, would resist only to its own destruction, and be torn in pieces by being thrown in the face of a breeze rapidly swelling to a gale.

My appeals were ineffectual; and the sentinels of the press as well as the public conscience slept, until the Carey ordination, in 1843, sent a shock of terror through the heart of the denomination, and caused every writer, not infected by the heresy, to grasp his pen, as men grasp their swords when an invading naval fleet suddenly pours its thousands of armed warriors upon their shores. The editor in Boston, — a gentleman whom I shall always respect for his amiable and manly qualities, — made a full statement of the case, together with some stringent and appropriate remarks. The following week, in the midst of

the excitement, I slipped in an article, of four columns in length, reviewing the principles involved in the case, in an earnest tone. At this, a large proportion of the clergy were much disturbed, and censures were freely passed upon the Witness in various quarters. About two weeks after, the Banner of the Cross, a very high church paper in Philadelphia, came out with an editorial, charging the Witness with disturbing the peace of the church against the wishes of the bishop of the diocese, and asserting that it had authority from a private source on which it could rely for making the assertion. The private informant was supposed to have been another editor of the Witness, residing in another town. Our worthy bishop immediately sent a letter to the Banner of the Cross, saying that while he agreed with the conductors of the Witness in their general views of christian doctrine, and of tractarianism, he yet disapproved of their course in disturbing his diocese with alarms which he did not believe to be necessary. To make the matter more perplexing, the other editor of the Witness alluded to, who highly disapproved of what myself and the Boston editor had written, preached a sermon soon after, and had it inserted in the Witness, in which he attempted to smooth over the whole matter, took ground directly opposite to that which we had taken, and, in fact, made the paper appear perfectly self-condemned and contemptible. He referred to the views of Dr. Pusey and of other tractarians; and affirmed that though they were unsound, yet, according to the theory of the church, they ought to be tolerated. He declared alarm to be entirely unnecessary, and deprecated any attempt to raise it.

This appeal to the compromise principle was so well received, and so generally conceded to be in harmony

with the accredited policy of the church, that the Boston managers of the Witness did not dare to reject it; and the paper was obliged to retire from the advanced position it had taken.

This convinced me more thoroughly than ever where the true source of our difficulties lay; and I immediately *began* the treatise now published; but not finding any suitable channel for conveying it to the public, I only made a beginning. I do not regret that it did not appear then, as my mind has now had time to mould the general subject into a better form.

The reader will easily see that a reformation conducted on a principle of compromise with Rome could not, in the nature of the case, be completed. A complete reformation concedes nothing to the enemy. It is absurd to talk of casting out all of Romanism, and yet gratify Romanists by retaining some things to please them.

CHAPTER II.

INTOLERANCE OF PURITY IN WORSHIP.

Had the early divines of the English church been permitted to exercise their christian judgment in reforming religion, without let or hindrance, the papistical ceremonies retained in the services would, at an early period, have been swept to the oblivion they so justly merit. But this they were not allowed to do. They had conceded to the *crown* the "power *to visit and reform all heresies, errors and other abuses*, which in the spiritual jurisdiction ought to be reformed;" had allowed this to be enacted by parliament; and had thus divested themselves of all right save that of petition. And, therefore, though the great body of the clergy in the Convocation of 1662 were decidedly in favor of removing *all* the ceremonies having a papal aspect; though the opposition to them among the clergy during the first thirty years of Elizabeth's reign was so general that they conscientiously abstained from supplying eight thousand out of the ten thousand churches in the Kingdom; though a strong effort was made to get rid of them at the Hampton Court conference in the reign of James I., another at the Savoy conference in the reign of Charles II., and still another at the meeting of the Jerusalem Chamber commission in that of William and Mary; though one thousand ministers of the established church met James I., on his way to the throne, and presented him with the famous "millenary petition," [the clergy *had* the right of *petition!*] praying for a removal of the remaining ceremonies; yet they were not removed. The occupant of the throne

said *nay;* and so the reformation was not carried to the extent which the church through several ages desired.

But the mischief of a secular headship of the church did not end here. When the ecclesiastical supremacy was given to the sovereign, it was a Tudor who occupied the throne; and when the effort was made in 1559 and onward to destroy the last vestiges of papacy, it was a Tudor again who swayed the sceptre; and a Tudor would brook no contradiction or resistance. Nothing made Henry VIII. more restive than for the clergy to resist his will in regard to any religious matter respecting which he chose to decree uniformity. And when certain of the clergy, in Elizabeth's reign, neglected to comply with the ceremonies, and it came to the queen's ears, she was angry, and wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury, reflecting with severity on his remissness in neglecting to enforce the act of uniformity; and "requiring him, that, with the assistance of other bishops, commissioned by her for causes ecclesiastical, he should give strict orders, that all diversities and varieties, both among the clergy and the people, might be reformed and repressed; and that all should be brought to one manner of uniformity, through the whole kingdom, that so the people might quietly honor and serve God."* Strype† reports the queen's letter more fully, and represents her as saying, among other things, "that she, considering the authority given her of God for the defence of public peace and truth in the church, meant not any longer to suffer these evils thus to proceed, spread and increase in her realm; but certainly determined to have all such diversities and novelties among the clergy and people (breeding noth-

* Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. iii., p. 460.
† Annals of the Ref., vol. i., pp. 460–1

ing but contention and offence, and being against the laws, good usages and ordinances of the realm) to be reformed and repressed, and brought to one manner of uniformity through the whole realm." * * * "And in time to come, charging him [the archbishop] straightly, to provide and enjoin in her name, in all places of his province, that none hereafter be admitted into any office, cure or place ecclesiastical, but such as should be found well disposed to common order," that is, uniformity in the use of the ceremonies.

Here was the *root* of the difficulty. The queen not only compelled the retaining of many ceremonies against the wishes of the clergy, but she *enforced* their observance. And from this time forward, except at particular times and to a limited extent, there was no toleration for those who disapproved of the remains of popery. The best protestant divines in the church were silenced because they could not conscientiously comply, and the church deprived of their services; while Roman priests, known to be such in heart, were allowed to officiate at her altars.* Thus the bishops and clergy were being trained to a tolerance of error in doctrine, and an intolerance of purity in worship; a training to which they were subjected under several succeeding reigns, until these principles were thoroughly wrought into their moral constitution. I have already alluded to the fact that eight thousand parish churches were suffered to go unsupplied, rather than permit those to officiate who would not conform to the senseless usages. Those members of the church who would not comply in the days of Laud, were, in the language of the London Chris-

* Strype's Annals, vol. i., p. 178.

tian Observer, "fined, and whipped, and dungeoned," till they were thought to be "effectually subdued." A historian relates that they were fined in the star chamber, till many of them were reduced from affluence to beggary; and the fines were *aggravated* to meet the expense of repairs on St. Paul's cathedral, which gave birth to the saying, that the church was built with the sins of the people.* And so severe were the ceremonial persecutions at this period, that Dr. Alexander Leighton, father of the celebrated archbishop, for publishing an appeal to parliament, was brought into the star chamber, and had a sentence passed upon him, the execution of which is thus recorded in Laud's diary. "His ears were cut off, his nose slit, his face branded with burning irons; he was tied to a post, and whipped with a treble cord, of which every lash brought away his flesh. He was kept in the pillory near two hours, in frost and snow." The historian adds, that he was then imprisoned, with peculiar severity, for about eleven years; and when released by the parliament, he could neither hear nor see, nor walk.† When this sentence was pronounced in the star chamber, Laud's gratification was such, that he publicly pulled off his cap and gave God thanks. Under such persecutions, it is not surprising that the dissentients began to turn their attention to foreign lands, and to say to each other, "The sun shines as pleasantly on America as on England, and the Sun of Righteousness much more clearly." Neal states that he had a list of seventy-seven divines ordained in the church of England, who became pastors of emigrant churches in America, as early as previous to the year 1640.

* Bogue and Bennett's Dissenters, vol. i., p. 79.
† Pierce, p. 179.

Thus were the ceremonies upheld, not by reason or argument,—for they admit of no defence on these grounds,—but by the power of the royal prerogatives, by acts of parliament, by the star chamber, &c., until by numerous additions made to them, they became too heavy a freight of iniquity, and sunk the ship of church and state in her own harbor, making room for unfurling the flag of the commonwealth.

On the restoration of Charles II., and, with him, the restoration of the church, one would have supposed that milder measures would have governed the councils of the nation; and such seems to have been the wish of many. But the Savoy conference soon put an end to such hopes on the part of any who might have indulged them. "In the convocation," says a historian, "the prayer-book was altered from bad to worse." The points debated were, the apocryphal lessons, compulsory kneeling at the Lord's supper, the use of the surplice, the cross in baptism, sponsors in baptism, and ecclesiastical holy days. The bishops declined any reasonable concessions, and "the conference," says bishop Burnet, "broke up without doing any good." And not only so: but Burnet says further, that "now all concern that seemed to employ the bishops' thoughts was, not only to make no alterations on their (the Presbyterians') account, but to make the terms of conformity much stricter than they had been before the war."* The result was, that, instead of relaxing at all, and mending the prayer-book, it was the next year made, as above expressed, "from bad to worse." New holy days were added, as *St. Barnabas*, and the *conversion of St. Paul;* and the reasonable objections to the apocryphal lessons in the calendar were met by *adding to*

* Burnet's Hist. of his Own Times, vol. i., p. 182.

*them the edifying story of Bel and the Dragon!"** And to crown the follies of this period, an act of uniformity in the observance of the ceremonies was passed in 1662, which took effect on St. Bartholomew's day, and expelled two thousand of its best and purest divines from the established church. And to make the persecution as severe as possible, St. Bartholomew's day was chosen for the act to take effect, because their yearly salaries became due a few days after, of which they were by this means deprived.† The celebrated Mr. Locke styles these two thousand ejected ministers, learned, pious and orthodox divines.

Nor did the persecuting spirit end with this period. James II. came to the throne with an honest avowal of popery in his mouth. Under him, the opposers of a ceremonialism were persecuted with increased violence. "Availing himself of Monmouth's rebellion‡ to crush the enemies of popery and arbitrary power, the king turned his realm into a slaughter-house; of which Judge Jeffreys was the grand butcher.§ After his western circuit, the quarters of several hundred persons were hung up all over the country, for fifty or sixty miles."‖ This state of things continued for a time, but was alleviated by a considerable amendment, before the revolution, which brought to the throne William of Orange. Between the restoration and the revolution, a period of less than thirty years, sixty thousand are said to have suffered for dissent, of whom five thousand died in prison. And during the three reigns which preceded this period, namely, those of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., large numbers of the best ministers were ejected from the church, and

* Burnet's Hist. of his Own Times, vol. i., p. 182.
† Ibid., vol i., p. 184. ‡ Warner, p. 631. § Pierce, 263—4.
‖ Bogue and Bennett's Dissenters, vol. i., p. 105.

prevented from preaching the gospel to perishing souls.* Bishops spent much of their time in hunting out of the church those who could not conform to every ceremony. And when one of them applied to a nobleman for his influence with the bishop in his behalf, the answer he received was, "Had you been guilty of drunkenness, or grosser immoralities, I could have procured you relief; but if you cannot comply with the ceremonies, you are undone. It is a crime in the eyes of the bishop for which there is no forgiveness."

The accession of William to the throne brought an "act of toleration," which has been called the dissenters' *Magna Charta*. By it, they were thenceforward exempted from the legal penalties annexed to non-conformity.

Thus I have briefly stated the cause which prevented an *entire* removal from the English ritual of all the

* What an awful violation of all the principles of the gospel, to shut the mouths of thousands of preachers, — depriving hundreds of thousands of souls of christian instruction, — merely because they would not employ a few senseless Romish rites! Whence did the church of England derive the authority to fasten such ceremonies upon the consciences of ministers, and to deprive the world of their labors, in case of a refusal to comply? Not from the word of God, surely, for that is full of instruction of an opposite kind.

Men often talk of schisms produced by puritans and non-conformists. It is a perversion of truth. Whatever schism was effected, it must lie at the door of the established church. That church imposed ceremonies which Christ never enjoined. It enforced its burdensome ceremonial as an essential thing; whereas Christ made an overgrown ceremonial unlawful, and even a simple one indifferent. This church put a yoke upon the necks of its people which Christ never designed or wished them to bear. They had a right to reject it; nay, they were bound to reject it, under the circumstances. They saw that they could not labor with acceptance among the people while they used such ceremonies. It was a plain scriptural duty, therefore, to cast them off as they would anything else that hindered the gospel from having a free course. And when no alternative was left them save compliance or ejection from the church, the schism was plainly on the English establishment.

papal ceremonies. Again and again the better sense of the church declared against them; but the royal mandates, the acts of parliament, the sentences of the star-chamber, the watchful intolerance of the bishops, the whip, the rack, the pillory, the dungeon, the expatriation, overmastered the protestant feelings of the national church, and *drove the ministers and people into compliance.* This compliance, however, could be effected only by one additional measure. When the dissenters in the church became so numerous as to make it probable that they would soon carry all the people with them, they were *cast out.* When arguments failed, as they always did, expulsion from the church came to their aid.

A hundred and thirty years' school of intolerance towards dissent was not lost upon the national church. Its clergy were thoroughly drilled into the belief that opposition to any portion of the ceremonial of the church, though no longer punishable by fine and imprisonment, was a very grave offence, and punishable, at least, by a complete moral proscription. And since the passage of the toleration act, dissent has not been starved by fines, or wasted by imprisonment; but it has been silenced and crushed in the church by a proscription which brings loss of influence, loss of place, loss of church caste, and loss of the means of usefulness.

These remarks are painfully illustrated in the treatment of those eminent servants of God, John and Charles Wesley. These gentlemen were warm, attached and steadfast friends of the church of England, as by law established. When invested with the responsibilities of the gospel ministry, they found that church cumbered with a spirit of worldliness, and doing little to make the spiritual truths of the gospel

felt among their countrymen. It was their special calling, as they believed, to break the slumbers of that church, to raise it up to the gospel standard, and to rekindle within it the light of the reformation. With this noble purpose in view, they labored in season and out of season, preaching Jesus and him crucified wherever they went.

Their object was a noble one, and with noble enthusiasm did they pursue it. And how were their labors received? By the poorer classes of the people with joy and thanksgiving. By the clergy and the aristocracy, they were treated with scorn and contempt. The pulpits of the established church were closed against them, and they were driven out into the highways, and the fields, where they were often made to feel the violence of the multitudes, excited against them by the high church supporters of formalism and exact conformity. Nor have these annoying, unchristian persecutions ceased, until a host of warm-hearted, pious, energetic, and chivalrous christians have been pushed entirely off the platform of the establishment, and practically compacted into a firm, united, high-resolving body of dissent.

In our own church, the lesson of proscription has been well learned from the mother church of England. So imperative have become the demands for a compliance with the *prescribed* notions among us, that very few have the courage to hold themselves apart from their adoption, and to spurn the bondage fastened upon the mind by them. I speak only what is generally known, and what those in bondage must themselves acknowledge, when I say there is *no alternative*, save *compliance on the one hand*, or *proscription on the other*. However liberal our church may be in doctrinal matters, it has *no* liberality in regard to the use-

less things of which I have been speaking. A man may have all the latitude he can ask in selecting his own mode of explaining doctrines. He may be a Calvinist, or an Arminian, or take his stand somewhere between the two, and the Episcopal church asks him no questions. He may have any range in his mode of explaining even the great doctrines of grace, and may even embrace many doctrines peculiar to the apostate church of Rome—nay, the offices of his church have been so "*contrived*," as Burnet expresses it, that he may have a wide sweep here, and free himself from restraint. But the moment he begins to adapt himself to mere externals, the non-essentials of his religion, he finds the executors of the church's laws cutting from him a pound of flesh here, and two pounds there, lopping off something of his length, or stretching him out to the right degree of elongation, until he answers in every particular to the prescribed pattern. It is not necessary to dwell on the absurdity, nay, the wickedness, of such a state of things.

These, then, as I have described them in this and in the preceding chapter, are the causes which have prevented the completion of the reformation in the Episcopal churches of England and America—a tolerance of error in doctrine, and an intolerance of purity in worship. These are historical facts, which lie open to the eyes of all men, and which cannot be gainsaid. In this tolerance, and this intolerance, the divines of these churches have been trained through a long succession of years; and no man can *study* the standards and ephemeral writings of these churches, entering into their spirit approvingly, and imbuing his mind with them, without becoming tolerant of error, even though he does not himself embrace error, and intolerant of purity in worship, even though he is not much

attached to the rags of popery which hang about our services. The same tolerance of error which, in the days of Elizabeth, attempted to conciliate the Romanists, is seen in the sermon of which I spoke in the last chapter, as published in the Witness, and in scores of sermons, pamphlets, newspapers, and books, published by those who are called moderate men all over the United States; and the same intolerance of purity in worship, which, as the London Christian Observer says, "had fined, and whipped, and dungeoned the puritans, both in and out of the church, and with them the old-fashioned Anglican churchmen, till they were thought to be effectually subdued," has been visited, in the shape of proscription, upon the head of the writer of this volume, because he has dared to revive the objections to the remains of popery. He has been met by his old friends with averted looks, and cold salutations; has been told plainly that, for holding and publishing these opinions, his influence was gone; has had the attempt made to push him out of the church, by circulating the report that he had left it; and in public places, with great vehemence, has been repeatedly denounced as a traitor to his church.

It is high time that the whole subject of our doctrines, polity, and ritual, were thrown open to free and full discussion. They are fair subjects of discussion; and it is disgrace enough that, to near the middle of the nineteenth century, they have been excluded *vi et armis*, from the circle of free inquiry. "An open Bible and a free conscience," with freedom of speech and the blessing of God; these are all I plead for. If our ritual will not bear the light shed upon it from these sources, the sooner it is riddled the better. Claiming this freedom of inquiry as my christian birthright, and in the exercise of it, asking no man or men's permis-

sion, and at the same time recognizing and respecting all other men's rights, I invite the reader to accompany me in a free investigation of the prayer-book, in the theological branch of my subject next claiming attention.

PART III.

THE THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

THE PRAYER-BOOK NEVER FULLY PURGED OF THE REMAINS OF PAPAL ERROR.

CHAPTER I.

METHOD OF INTERPRETING THE PRAYER-BOOK.

The men who conducted the reformation in the English church, it is well known, were bred in the Roman school. They were in early life thoroughly indoctrinated with Roman theology, and habits of superstitious Romish feeling were wrought into the very frame-work of their souls. Romish phraseology had become a part of their mental furniture; and to employ the idiom of Rome was as natural as to speak their vernacular tongue. It were unreasonable to expect of such men, that, in casting off false doctrine, they would do the work in its entireness *at once;* and that they would not need *time* to rid themselves wholly of forms of expression to which they had been accustomed from childhood. The foreigner, when he reaches our shores, though he has left behind him, it may be, some portion of his religion, and of the principles of government which have been taught him from his youth, still feels their influence upon him for many years, or rather, perhaps, never succeeds in wholly ridding himself of them. He brings with him the brogue which he learned from his mother, and many of the forms of speech and domestic habits peculiar to his native coun-

try. How much more certainly might we expect that a Romanist, whose religion is so very peculiar, in whose eyes every outward ordinance is full of a divine life, who worships an incarnate Deity in the bread and wine of the Lord's supper, and who has learned to connect the word *holy* with the place, the forms and the circumstances, as well as the object of worship, would retain for a long time the vestiges of Romish doctrines, feelings and forms of speech.

We find the facts of history to be in perfect harmony with these suggestions of reason. Light broke in upon the minds of these reformers in a very gradual way; and when their conceptions of truth had reached a certain degree of conformity to evangelical protestantism, they were embodied in a book of common prayer. As these views became gradually moulded to a nearer conformity to scriptural truth, this book was, from time to time, subjected to processes of amendment. And when queen Elizabeth said the reformation should go no further, and the prayer-book was improved for the last time, it became the embodied *results* of the reformation; so that, by surrounding it from that time to the present with associations of greater and still greater sanctity, whatever errors were then left in the minds of the reformers, have been *preserved*, like the embalmed mummies of Egypt. They differ from the mummies, however, in having been kept in a living, active and reproductive state.

The prayer-book, then, is a transcript of the English reformation. By what rule or standard shall we interpret it? Of course, by the events out of which it sprung; by the opinions of the reformers who compiled it; by the reformation which it embodies and represents. This is the rule Mr. Butler has adopted in his "Common Prayer Interpreted," and it is undoubt-

edly the best yet employed. I adopt it, therefore, as the rule by which to ascertain what the prayer-book *means;* but not to settle the *truth* of its meaning. *This* must be tried by a higher and safer standard. We have had enough of appealing to the reformation, the fathers, and the church, in settling christian doctrine. It is high time the scriptures were made the supreme and *sole* rule of faith, *practically* as well as theoretically. As the prayer-book, however, embodies a transcript of the reformation, it is right to appeal to the reformation to ascertain *what* doctrines it teaches.

It was proved, in former chapters, that this reformation was begun under accidental circumstances; that by being placed under the control of the English monarch, and made dependent on his caprices, it cut itself off from the *certainty* of a steady progress and a triumphant issue; and that it was, in fact, unsteady in its progress, and incomplete in its results. It was proved that its incompleteness arose from two causes,—a tolerance of Roman doctrine, and an intolerance of purity in worship; the one operating to retain Roman doctrine, the other to prevent the loss of papal ceremonies.

With these facts before us, and viewing the prayer-book as the embodiment of the reformation, we may presume *a priori*, without opening its pages, that it contains traces, more or less distinct, of the ancient corruptions, out of which the reformation aimed to lift the English church. The reformation we have seen to be imperfect; the prayer-book, if it be a fair representation of it, must be imperfect also. The presumption is, therefore, that the prayer-book is a compound of truth and error; or rather, that it contains, in connection with its large amount of truth, a hurtful mixture of error.

But this is only *presumption.* It is not *certainty.* Finding a *fountain* muddy, it may be inferred, with tolerable safety, that the *stream* is muddy. Notwithstanding most persons would prefer to examine the stream also, before making a positive decision, because it may have been cleansed by passing through a stratum of earth. Let us turn our attention, then, to the doctrinal contents of the liturgy. They lie before us with the light of history shining upon them to tell us *what* they mean, and the clearer light of revelation to decide whether their meaning is in harmony with eternal truth.

CHAPTER II.

THE COMMUNION OFFICE.

Doctrinal corruptions of the sacraments have usually been antecedent to the other corruptions which characterize the tractarian and Roman systems, and in no small degree *productive* of them. In searching for the causes of Puseyism in the prayer-book, therefore, the first proper business is to examine the communion and baptismal offices.

Against our communion office I urge one cardinal objection, which, if sustained, must exclude it from the fellowship of pure protestant truths, and consign it to a companionship at least with semi-Roman teaching. It inculcates, as I believe, a presence *in the elements* — not a *carnal*, but a *spiritual* presence. I am aware that this is not exactly the Roman doctrine, but it is precisely the tractarian, and differs from the Roman only in being a little more misty and obscure.

It may be remarked here, that the English communion service is not exposed fully to the objection now urged to our own. It does not contain the *oblation* and *invocation*. These, as they stand in our service, are as follows:

"Wherefore, O Lord, and Heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension;

rendering unto thee most hearty thanks, for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same. And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour, Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood."

These parts of the service were in the first prayer-book of Edward the Sixth; but at the revision of the book, under that monarch, they were struck out, on the ground that they favored the idea of a sacrifice in the supper. Happily, they have never been restored to the English service book. They were reëngrafted upon our service at the revision of the liturgy by our General Convention in the year 1789. They were introduced at the special request and solicitation of bishop Seabury, a man who received his episcopal ordination in Scotland, and who had embraced the high sacramentarian views held by the bishops in that country. How the usual sagacity of bishop White was imposed upon so far as to overlook the vicious import of these sentences, and to permit their introduction without remonstrance, it is not easy to conjecture.

The oblatory words contain, it seems to me, one very essential error. It consists in what is *implied* in offering the bread and wine to God. The Rev. Mr. Butler, in his "Common Prayer Interpreted," quotes from the "Comparison between the communion offices of the Church of England and the Scottish Episcopal Church," in which the author, after citing the words "*which we now offer unto thee*," says of them, "*They*

imply a direct offering of the bread and wine as a sacrifice." He is speaking, to be sure, of the Scotch office; but as the words were taken by our General Convention from that office, it is no more than fair to give them the same interpretation. Viewed in any light, they present themselves as plainly inconsistent with the thirty-first article, which boldly designates other offerings, except that of "Christ once made," as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." And to remind the reader of their utter incompatibility with anything contained in the Scriptures, seems almost superfluous.

Not only is there the *sacrificial* idea conveyed in offering the "holy gifts" to God, but in the invocation, there is some kind of a change in the elements implied in the invoking upon them of the power of the "Word and Holy Spirit." This invocation is also thoroughly unscriptural. The records of God's word will be searched in vain for the slightest trace of any authority for this act.

Let us look for a few moments at the account of the institution of the supper contained in the New Testament. Matthew says, "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."* Mark's account is nearly identical with Matthew's. Luke says, "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup,

* Matthew xxvi.

after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you."* St. Paul records the account of the institution thus: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus Christ, the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, saying, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner, also, he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."†

These three accounts, it will be seen, are substantially the same. Matthew uses the expression, "He took bread and blessed *it*." *It* is not in the original; and learned men affirm that the word *God* might be more properly supplied, so that the sentence should read, "He took bread and blessed *God*." This rendering is certainly more in harmony with the statements of Luke and Paul. Luke's words are, "He took bread, and *gave thanks*,"—Paul's, "He took bread, and *when he had given thanks*, he brake it."

Now compare this scriptural account of the supper with the words of our office. The officiating minister is required by our service to invoke God's Word and Holy Spirit to *bless* and *sanctify* the bread and wine; and the *object* of the blessing and sanctifying of them is declared to be "*that* we, receiving them," may be partakers of Christ's "most blessed body and blood." Our Saviour does not even ask God's blessing upon the bread and wine, but merely blesses God for them. He gives no hint of the elements being a channel of divine grace to us.

* Luke xxii. 19, 20. † 1 Cor. xi. 23—25.

The minister is required by the service to offer the bread and wine to God, certainly in the form, if not with the intent, of a sacrifice. Our Saviour did nothing but bless God, and offer the elements to his disciples. The service calls the elements "*holy* gifts," and "*holy mysteries.*" The Scriptures are silent as the sepulchre as to any *holiness* connected with the elements; and I have no doubt they are intentionally so, that there might not be any possible excuse for the error of a presence in the bread and wine. Could there well be a more striking contrast and dissimilarity? On the scriptural side, there is the blessing God, the giving the bread and wine to the disciples, the declaring them symbols in strongly figurative language, and the direction that the repetition of the service shall be, through all time, a *memorial act.* This is all; no consecrating the elements by invoking the Holy Ghost upon them;* no *intimation* even that, in

* But one passage of Scripture occurs to me, which, by any possibility, can be made even to appear to favor this idea. "The cup of blessing, *which we bless*," &c., (1 Cor. x. 16.) It is usually inferred from these words, that the apostles, in their official capacity as ministers of the New Testament, were in the habit of blessing or consecrating the wine. But as all the scriptural accounts of the institution of the supper go to show that our Saviour did no such thing, it is not to be presumed, without the clearest evidence, that the apostles varied essentially from his example. We have seen that Christ did not bless either the bread or the wine, but merely rendered thanks, and blessed God. Since this passage is highly figurative, would it not be safer to give it an interpretation which would bring it into harmony with all the other Scriptures which relate to the same subject? The cup of blessing, upon the receiving of which we render thanks and bless God; would not such a rendering be admissible? It would certainly relieve the passage from the contrariety to other Scriptures, which the usual interpretation gives; and does not appear to me at all to transcend the latitude which its highly figurative character allows.

After publishing this in the Christian Alliance, I received the following communication, with which I am happy to strengthen the position taken:

"Dear Sir.—In your article on the communion service, in arguing against a change in the elements, in consequence of the consecration, you remark, 'Our Saviour does not even ask God's blessing on

consequence of any act of consecration, we, receiving them, may be able to receive the body and blood of Christ; no employing them theatrically to make a

the bread and wine, but merely blesses God for them;' you also say, there is 'no consecrating the elements by invoking the Holy Ghost upon them.' In a note you consider the consistency of 1 Cor. x. 16, 'The cup of blessing which we bless' with this view, and ask whether it would not be admissible to render the passage thus, 'The cup of blessing on the receiving of which we render thanks and bless God.'

"I think you have presented the true view of the passage; and I do not doubt that it will gratify you to be assured that others who had no argumentative end to gain have taken substantially the same view before you. For it will thus be rendered evident that you have not resorted to an evasion to escape a difficulty, but have followed what the most eminent interpreters regard as the true sense of the passage.

"To evince that this is so, I make the following quotation from Bloomfield, an eminent critic and commentator, and now Lord Bishop of London, and, of course, a thorough Episcopalian.

"'The cup of blessing.' This is best explained as put for 'the cup for, or over which, we give thanks to God,' and it is supposed to have been a popular phrase to denote the *eucharist*, and adopted from what was called the cup of blessing at the paschal feast. 'Which we bless,' is exegetical of 'the cup of blessing,' and, according to the *most eminent interpreters ancient and modern*, is put for, 'on account of which we give thanks to God.' So far Bloomfield.

"Here then, according to the most eminent interpreters, ancient and modern, there is giving thanks to God, on account of the cup, but no blessing of the cup — no consecration of the wine.

"It may also interest you and your readers to know Bloomfield's opinion of Matt. xxvi. 26 — translated in our version, 'He took bread and blessed it, and brake it.' He declares that the common text is not correct, and ought to be so altered as to agree with Luke xxii. 19, and 1 Cor. xi. 24; i. e., instead of *ευλογησας* it should read *ευχαριστησας*. In this way no translation is possible except 'he took the bread and having given thanks, he brake it.' He has accordingly so changed the text, and says in his note, 'It is not easy to imagine stronger authority of manuscripts, versions, fathers, and early editions, than that which exists for this reading, instead of the common one.'

"'From the term *ευχαριστησας*, the rite afterwards took its name, i. e. *eucharist*, especially as the service was a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.' He then refers to the universal custom of the Jews of giving thanks to God, before the reception of any food, as illustrating the giving of thanks in this case.

"Nor is this all. Philologists of the greatest authority assign to *ευλογησας*, which occurs in Mark xiv. 22, the same sense as to *ευχαριστησας*, (i. e., gave thanks,) in the other passages, as may be seen by any one who will consult Schleusner's and Wahl's Lexicons, and Rosenmuller's and Kuinoel's Commentaries. Indeed, the same word

memorial service before God; no offering them to God in the manner of a sacrifice; and no pronouncing them "*holy*," or in any sense *mysterious*. In short, so far as this part of the service is concerned, it would not be easy to make it more unlike the scriptural account of the supper.

Whatever this service may mean, therefore, it teaches something which the Scriptures do *not* teach. That something I have already affirmed to be a spiritual presence in the elements. As this, however, will be denied, it seems proper to give more particular attention to it. But let it not be forgotten that I have proved the service to be thoroughly *unscriptural*, so that *whatever* it teaches, it does not teach scriptural truth. The very *least* that can be said against it is, that where heartily received, it prevents the mind from embracing the doctrine of the ordinance in its

εὐλογησας, is used in Mark vi. 41, where Christ gave thanks before breaking and distributing the loaves and fishes. Here surely was no sacramental consecration, and change of bread and fish. So in Mark viii. 7, the same word is used to denote giving thanks before distributing a few small fishes. Here is simply thanksgiving before a common meal, and yet precisely the same word and form are used as when describing the eucharist.

"There is, then, no reason to doubt that Rosenmuller, Bloomfield and others are correct, when they say that Christ, in establishing the eucharist, simply followed, on a more solemn occasion, the universal Jewish practice of neither eating nor drinking anything at any meal, till they had first *given thanks* to God.

"I could with ease multiply authorities to sustain Bloomfield's views of 1 Cor. x. 16, but I forbear.

"I am thus particular in sustaining your views, because I regard this as a point of great moment. It proves that Christ had no more design to act on or to change the bread and the wine in the eucharist, than we have to act on or change our food in a common meal, when for it we give thanks to God. There is no more mystery in one case than in the other.

"The design of Christ was simply to give thanks to God, on a most solemn and affecting occasion, and nothing more or less. Thus is all transubstantiation, consubstantiation, and spiritual or mystical presence in the elements, cut up by the roots, and an intelligent, grateful commemoration of the death of Christ alone remains."

simplicity; suggests to it the idea of a sacrifice; fills it with confused ideas of some mysterious supernatural energy acting through the elements; puts it on a blind chase after something not distinctly defined, and thus prepares it to embrace just such view as the current superstition of the hour, or especially as the general teaching of Episcopalian divines, may be thought to sanction.

And now to the proof that the service does teach *a spiritual presence in the elements.* I think it *more than probable*, from the plain import of the words themselves, that they were intended to teach such a doctrine. To my mind they very clearly convey such an idea; for they not only invoke the power of the Holy Ghost upon the elements, but they also assign a descent of the Spirit upon them, as the means of preparing them for conveying the body and blood of Christ to the communicant. Observe the force of the words, "Vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine,"—for what purpose?—"*that* we, receiving them," &c., "may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood." The necessary inference is, that the Holy Ghost, coming down upon the elements at the time of consecration, makes them the channels of conveying, supernaturally, the body and blood of Christ; and that, without this mingling of the Spirit with them, or mysterious change wrought in them by the Spirit, they would not answer their intended end in the sacrament. I know not what other meaning can fairly be drawn out of the words.

We shall be helped in settling the truth of this interpretation, by refering to the recorded opinions of the reformers, and other leading English divines. If they held the notion of a spiritual presence in the elements,

we may conclude that the obvious sense which we have seen lying upon the face of those words is past all doubt the true one.

Our evangelical writers have laid much stress on the fact that the English reformers speak strongly against the Roman doctrine of a carnal or corporal presence. Within the last two or three years, I have been often struck with the circumstance that, in contending against the Roman doctrine, they almost invariably use either the word "carnal" or "corporal."* I might fill an octavo volume with sentences of this kind; and I invite the reader's attention particularly to this fact, and also to another fact bearing directly on the point in hand, namely, that they seldom start an objection to a *spiritual* presence in the elements. A *spiritual* presence seems with them to have been the scriptural antithesis to the *carnal* presence of the Romanists. All admit that it is Romish to hold the corporal presence of Christ in the elements. It would be difficult, I apprehend, to show that it is less essentially Romish, or rather, I should say, less essentially *heretical*, to hold that the spiritual nature of Christ is *joined with the elements*. "Any view," says a distinguished writer, "is to be rejected, which involves the idea of a descent into the elements:" and I may add that any view is especially to be avoided, which involves the idea that this descent is effected by the consecrating prayer of the minister; that when

* Cardwell, in his Hist. of Conferences, &c., p. 383, states that when the rubric, explaining the reason for kneeling to receive the Lord's supper, was restored in the reign of Charles II., instead of the words, "Any *real* and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood," it was made to read, "Any *corporal* presence," &c.; thus showing that while there was a readiness to commit the church against any *corporal* presence, there was no disposition to condemn the notion of a "*real* and *essential* presence," even "of Christ's *natural flesh and blood*."

the prayer is said over the bread and wine, "the Spirit," in the language of another, "descends and lights upon them." Here is where a large portion of the English divines and their imitators stumble. This is essential error. It puts the Spirit, in a sense, at the disposal of the priest, and clothes the divine nature of the Son of God, not indeed as the Romanist does, in a fleshly, but, what is equally erroneous, in a vegetable garment. So that if there is not present "God *manifest in the flesh*," there is God *clothed in another form of matter*, which amounts to the same thing. In both cases alike there is present the divine Saviour clad in an earthly garment, and in the one case, as in the other, entitled to divine worship. With what propriety those who take this view can condemn the Romanist for adoring the host, I cannot see.

It avails nothing to object that this view does not involve the *opus operatum* idea, since the receiving of Christ is altogether conditional, depending on the faith of the believer; for then it amounts simply to this,— that the elements being charged with a divine essence, as the jar of the experimenter is charged with electricity, convey, by themselves, spiritual influences, and impart spiritual graces, to such as have spiritual affinities for the divine gift conveyed. It is a physical idea throughout, representing believers and unbelievers as receiving or not receiving the divine Spirit, conveyed along with the elements, just as conducting and non-conducting bodies receive or decline the electric fluid when brought in contact with a body containing it.

But it is time to ascertain whether the English reformers and others *did* hold this view of a spiritual presence in the elements, and also a spiritual *change* in the elements.

Bishop Ridley, whose mind contributed not a little to give a cast to this reformation, says:

"Always my protestation reserved, I answer thus: that in the sacrament is a certain *change*, in that that bread which was before common bread, is now made a lively presentation of Christ's body, and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth his body; that even as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of Christ's body, which the eyes of faith see, as the bodily eyes see only bread. Such a sacramental *mutation* I grant to be in the bread and wine, *which truly is no small change, but such a change as no mortal man can make, but only that omnipotence of Christ's word.*"*

Bishop Overall. "*That we, receiving these, thy creatures of bread and wine*, &c., *may be partakers of his blessed body and blood.* Together with the *hallowed elements of bread and wine*, we may receive the body and blood of Christ, which are truly exhibited in this sacrament, the one as well as the other." "It is *confessed by all divines*, [that is, the English divines,] that *upon the words of the consecration*, the body and blood of Christ are really and substantially present, and so *exhibited and given* to all who receive them; and all this is not after a *physical* and *sensual*, but after a *heavenly* and *incomprehensible* manner. *These holy mysteries were the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood*," &c. "Before consecration, we call them God's creatures of bread and wine; now we do so no more after consecration; wherein we have the advantage of the church of Rome, who call them still creatures in their very mass, after consecration."†

* Works, p. 274. † Notes to the Book of Common Prayer.

Bishop Bramhall. "Having viewed all your strength with a single eye, I find not one of your arguments that comes home to transubstantiation, but only to a true and real presence; which no genuine son of the church of England did ever deny, no, nor your adversary himself. Christ said, 'This is my body;' what he said we do most steadfastly believe. He said not after this or that manner, *neque con*, *neque sub*, *nequa trans*."*

Bishop Cosins. "As far as we openly profess, with St. Bernard, that the presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament, [by the expression 'in the sacrament,' these writers almost invariably mean, in the elements,] *is spiritual*, and, therefore, *true* and *real*, and with the same Bernard, and all the ancients, we deny that the body of Christ is *carnally* either present or given."†

Bishop Sparrow. "The words are pronounced by the lips of the priest, but the elements are *consecrated* by the *power* and *grace* of Christ."‡

Hooker. "*This bread hath in it more than our eyes behold;* this cup, *hallowed with solemn benediction*, availeth to the endless life and welfare of soul and body," &c. * * * * "What these elements are in themselves, it skilleth not."§ Again, "*By blessing visible elements*, *it* [the ministry] *maketh them invisible graces*."

Bishop Taylor. "The Doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of the protestants, in this article, is, that after the minister of the *holy mysteries* hath rightly prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and wine, the symbols *become changed into the body and blood of Christ*, after a sacramental, that is, in a *spiritual*, *real* manner."‖ Again, "When the holy

* Works, p. 15. † History of Transubstantiation, p. 53.
‡ Rationale upon the Common Prayer.
§ Ecc. Pol. Book, vol. vi., p. 67. ‖ Real Presence, vol. ix., p. 424.

man stands at the table of blessing, and ministers the rite of consecration, then do as the angels do, who behold, and love, and wonder, that the Son of God should become food to the souls of his servants; that he who cannot suffer any change or lessening should *be broken into pieces*, and enter into the body to support and nourish the spirit."* Again, "Have mercy upon us, O heavenly Father, according to thy glorious mercies and promises, send thy Holy Ghost upon our hearts, and let him also *descend upon these gifts*, that by his good, his holy, his glorious presence, he may sanctify and enlighten our hearts, and he may bless and sanctify *these gifts*.

"That this bread *may become* the holy body of Christ. Amen.

"And this chalice *may become* the life-giving blood of Christ. Amen."†

Bishop Ken. "I believe, O crucified Lord, that the bread which we break, in the celebration of the holy mysteries, is the communication of thy body, and the cup of blessing which we bless, is the communication of thy blood, and that thou dost as effectually and really convey thy body and blood to our souls, *by the bread and wine*, as thou didst thy Holy Spirit by thy breath to thy disciples, for which all love, all glory be to thee."‡

Wheatley. "In these words of the consecration prayer, 'Hear us, O merciful Father,' &c., the sense of the former is still implied, and consequently, by these, *the elements are now consecrated*, and so *become* the body and blood of our Saviour."

Perhaps these extracts are extended too far already.

* Holy Living, vol. iv., p. 269.
† Office for the Holy Communion, vol. xv., p. 299.
‡ Exposition of the Church Catechism.

I might extend them much further. If they have any definite meaning, it is one in harmony with the construction I have put upon the communion office. They teach — and affirm the teaching to be that of the English church — that in the act of consecration by the priest, there occurs what Ridley calls "a certain *change*," and "*mutation*;" that this change is "*spiritual*," and "*incomprehensible*," in opposition to the one contended for by the Romanists, which is *physical*, and "*carnal*;" that this *change* is "*into the body and blood of Christ*," and is "*true*" and "*real*;" that, in consequence of the elements having "become" thus really changed, *they really* "*convey*" to the believer the body and blood of Christ. This is exactly the teaching which lies upon the face of our communion office, and since it turns out to be the current teaching of such leading divines as have at different periods chiefly controlled the English church, the writer thinks it would be subversive of the rules of fair interpretation, to give it any other than its most obvious meaning.*

I have extended this chapter to a considerable length, because it is one of the vital points in the discussion. The *dramatic* character of the communion service, strengthens very essentially, in my mind, the force of the above objections; but this belongs to the philosophical branch of my subject, and I forego the immediate advantage to be derived from it here, for the purpose of preserving the order of the subjects. The

* Beside the doctrinal objection to this office here urged, it is often made a subject of complaint by clergymen, in feeble health, on account of its great length, and the peculiar construction of its sentences. These, it is said, make its recitation more exhausting to the lungs than any other part of a clergyman's duty. How strange, that ministers will chafe and gall their necks with a yoke which God never required them to wear!

reader may be reminded here, that as the argument is cumulative throughout, he can only judge fairly of the force of its particular branches, when he shall have seen the whole, and surveyed their united as well as separate bearings.

CHAPTER III.

THE BAPTISMAL OFFICE.

THERE are few evangelical men in our church who will not confess, that, if their own personal wishes could be attained, they would have a few words altered in the baptismal office. This is, indeed, regarded commonly as the most exceptionable part of the prayer-book. Still the attempt has very generally been made to bend its strong language into conformity with the truth; to press it into unison with the enunciations of an evangelical faith. With what success will appear, I hope, before I reach the end of this chapter.

As a help for ascertaining the meaning of this office, I may draw the reader's attention once more to the opinions of the reformers.

The first question needing to be settled is this: Is there any evidence for believing that the leading reformers thought the baptismal water was so changed or sanctified by the Holy Ghost, as to be capable of effecting something in the soul which it could not effect in its natural state? Having proved the same thing in regard to the bread and wine in the supper, I need not lumber these pages with a large amount of testimony. Let the language of Jewel be taken as a specimen under this head:

"St. Chrysostom saith: 'Plain or bare water worketh not in us; but when it hath received the grace of the Holy Ghost, *it washeth away our sins*.' So saith St. Ambrose, also: 'The Holy Ghost cometh down and halloweth the water;' and 'there is the presence of the Trinity.' So saith St. Cyril: 'As water thoroughly

heated with fire burneth as well as the fire, so the waters that wash the body of him that is baptized are changed into divine power by the working of the Holy Ghost.' So saith St. Leo, some time bishop of Rome: 'Christ hath given like preëminence to the water of baptism as he gave to his mother for that power of the Highest, and that overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, which brought to pass that Mary should bring forth the Saviour of the world, and hath also brought to pass that *the water should bear anew, or regenerate him that believeth.*' Such opinion had the ancient learned fathers, and such reverent words they used when they entreated of the sacraments. For it is not man, but God, which worketh by them."—*Of Sacraments*, (Tracts of the Anglican Fathers,) p. 72.

I invite particular attention to the words quoted above from Cyril,—"As water thoroughly heated with fire *burneth as well as the fire*, so the *waters* that wash the body of him that is baptized *are changed into divine power* by the working of the Holy Ghost,"—that is, so as to do the same thing in the soul which the Holy Ghost does, *just as water heated with fire does the same as fire does.*

The next proper question is, Did the reformers believe that in, by, or through baptism, the soul is cleansed, purged, regenerated, new-created? Take the following from Cranmer as a sample:

"And the second birth is by the water of baptism, which Paul called the bath of regeneration, *because our sins be forgiven us in baptism, and the Holy Ghost is poured into us as into God's beloved children, so that, by the power and working of the Holy Ghost, we be born again, spiritually, and made new creatures.* And so, by baptism, we enter into the kingdom of God, and are saved forever, if we continue, to our lives' end, in

the faith of Christ."—*Of Baptism*, (Tracts of the Anglican Fathers,) p. 1.

And the following from Dr. Lancelot Ridley:

"Here (Ephesians v. 26) is showed how Christ hath purged his church truly in the fountain of water, by his word, although God, of his mere mercy and goodness, without all man's deserts or merits, only for Christ's sake, hath washed and purged man from sin; yet *he useth a mean, by the which he cleanseth man from sin, which is baptism, in water, by the word of God; and so, in baptism, are our sins taken away, and we from sin purged, cleansed, and regenerated in a new man*, to live an holy life, according to the Spirit and will of God."—*Commentary on the Ephesians*, in Richmond's Fathers of the English Church, ii.

Cranmer's words are, the reader will observe, "Our sins are forgiven us in baptism, and the *Holy Ghost is poured into us;*" and that "we be born again, *spiritually*, and made new creatures." Ridley's are, that baptism is a "*mean* by the which God *cleanseth man from sin;*" and that we are in baptism, "*purged, cleansed, regenerated.*" With these strong words in mind, from men who contributed not a little to form that mass of public opinion amid which the prayer-book had its birth, and one of whom was in fact the presiding spirit in its formation, let us turn to the baptismal office.

The first thing that strikes the mind in this office is the strong phraseology peculiar to the period in which it had its origin. It speaks the language of Cranmer, and Ridley, and Jewel; does it *mean* what they so evidently meant when they used similar language? The presumption certainly is, that it does. But let us take its words in our hands, as it were, and handle them, and see if we can draw any other mean-

ing from them than that baptism effects a *spiritual* change in the soul.

On the very threshold of the office, we meet these words: "And by the baptism of thy well beloved Son, Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, *didst sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin;*" and in a subsequent part of the service, "*sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin;*" words which cannot fairly be construed to mean anything else than the general idea conveyed in the strong passages which Jewel quotes with approbation from the fathers, and which evidently imply that *the water is, in some mysterious, supernatural way, endowed by the Holy Ghost with power to wash away sin;* for it is immediately added, "and grant that this child, now to be baptized *therein*, [in this water, thus sanctified for the mystical washing away of sin,] *may receive the fulness of thy grace.*"

This office, then, teaches some kind of a change in the *water*, as the communion office does in the *bread* and *wine*. Does it also agree with the reformers in teaching the other doctrine spoken of above, namely, a spiritual change or renovation of the soul effected in baptism? I think it does. The following seems to me very much to this point. "We call upon thee for this infant, that he, *coming to thy holy baptism*, may receive remission of sin, by *spiritual regeneration*,"—"*spiritual*," not ecclesiastical, regeneration. And again: "Give thy *Holy Spirit to this infant*, that he may *be born again*, and *made an heir of everlasting salvation*." To receive the "*Holy Spirit*," and to "be born again" in baptism, in such a way as to be "made an heir of everlasting salvation," is certainly to receive all the spiritual change one is capable of, and all that can be needed. The same in their general import are these

words: "O merciful God, grant that the old Adam in this child *may be so buried* that the *new man may be raised up in him.* Grant that *all sinful affections may die in him.*" "Seeing now, dearly deloved brethren, that this child is *regenerate*, and grafted into the body of Christ's church." And again: "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to *regenerate* this infant *with thy Holy Spirit*, to receive him *for thine own child*, and to incorporate him into thy holy church. And humbly we beseech thee to grant, that he, *being dead unto sin*, and living unto righteousness, and *being buried with Christ in his death*, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that as he *is* made partaker of the death of thy Son, he may also be partaker of his resurrection," &c.

It is not my purpose to enter upon any scriptural argument to show that infants are not "really regenerated by *a change of their moral nature*, in baptism, as its source, or cause, or instrument;" for this, says the Rev. Mr. Butler, in his "Common Prayer Interpreted," does "overthrow all the statements of scripture." It is admitted, almost universally, among evangelical churchmen, that such a view of baptism is not true, wherever found. All I need to do, therefore, —for I am not writing to convince Romanists or tractarians,—is to show that such *is* the teaching of the baptismal office.

And now, can the strong passages I have cited mean merely an outward change? It does appear to me that, to say so, is to set at naught all the help to be derived from a knowledge of what the framers of the liturgy believed, and practically to avow the impossibility of expressing an inward moral change of the soul by any language whatever. For how is it possi-

ble to find stronger language than has been quoted above? First, there is the prayer that the water may be sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin; then, that the child, being baptized therein, may receive the *fulness of God's grace;* then, that, *coming to baptism*, it may not only receive "remission of sin," but "*spiritual* regeneration;" that it may be "born again," and "made an *heir* of everlasting salvation;" that the "old Adam may be *buried* in him," and that all "sinful affections may die in him," &c. Such things are prayed for. And after the child is baptized, the people are told that it is "*regenerated*," and grafted into the church; and God is also thanked that he has been pleased to "*regenerate*" the child by his "*Holy Spirit*," and to adopt him as his "own child." In the same prayer, it is also affirmed, that the child is now "dead unto sin," and buried with Christ in his death.

It is almost unnecessary to say that no words can more fully express the idea of a "change of the moral nature" effected "in baptism." It is plain that the interpretation of this service, which makes it mean a mere "change of state," is lame at every point. To the mind of one who should read the service for the first time, knowing nothing of the controversies respecting it, the thought could not be even suggested. Burnet, in describing the Savoy Conference, speaks of the changes in the liturgy demanded by the presbyterians, and after referring to other alterations insisted on, he says, "They excepted to *many parts* of the office of baptism *that import the inward regeneration of all that were baptized.*"* The passage is particularly valuable in this connection, as embodying Bur-

* His Own Times, vol. i., p. 180.

net's testimony to the fact that several parts of the baptismal office do import an "inward regeneration;" and this testimony is the more valuable as it is altogether incidental. He speaks of such a sense as if it were then everywhere taken for granted, as if no other had been thought of. And although I do not affirm it,—for I have not sufficiently examined the point,—yet my belief is, that *all* Episcopalian writers, before Burnet's time, understood this office to teach a spiritual change of the soul in baptism. I observe that in bishop Brownell's Commentary on the prayer-book, his quotations from earlier authors give it this interpretation, while his citations from writers of our own time generally adopt the notion of a mere "admission into the christian church, the kingdom of Christ existing in a two-fold state—on earth and in heaven." Should I prove to be right in regard to the *modern* origin of this latter interpretation, any person who will point me to the author who first broached it, will confer a special favor.

In answer to the objection that the word "regeneration" means only an outward grafting into the church, it is scarcely necessary to say one syllable; because, in the first place, the opposite is plain from the expression, "regenerated *and* grafted into the church," showing that regenerating and grafting are two different things; and, in the second place, there is not, in this office, a mere using of the word "regenerate;" but all the other strong terms, implying a moral change of the soul, are also employed.

To the views here urged it is objected, that, as the Scriptures speak of the visible church as holy because it is so by profession, so the prayer-book addresses adult candidates for baptism as if they really possessed what they profess to have, and of infants as regenerated be-

cause they are so by consecration and profession. But the same remark is again applicable, that the word regeneration is not used alone. It is backed up with all the strong phrases which denote an inward change. The subjects of baptism are said not only to be regenerated, but to have the Holy Spirit given to them, to be born again, to be made heirs of everlasting salvation, to be received as the children of God by adoption, to have the old Adam buried in them, to have all sinful affections die in them, to have the new man raised up in them, to be buried with Christ in his death, to be dead unto sin, to be made partakers of the death of the Son of God.

Moreover, the prayer-book not only takes it for granted that adult persons receiving baptism actually possess what they profess to have, but it represents that possession as *conferred by baptism;* and in this consists the heresy.

To show that this is so, I remark, in the first place, that the introductory exhortation addressed to the congregation is constructed entirely on the supposition that the persons coming to be baptized are in a state of nature. For the congregation are first told that persons "in the flesh cannot please God, but live in sin," &c.; and they are then called upon to pray that God would "grant these persons that which by nature they cannot have," and which, of course, they have not now; and "that they may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's church, and"—by being so baptized and so received—"be made *lively members* of the same." Then, to confirm the idea, already conveyed, that they are yet "in the flesh," a prayer is offered that "they, coming to holy baptism, may receive *remission of their sins*, and *spiritual regeneration*,—implying that their sins had not

been previously remitted, and that they had not before experienced spiritual regeneration. And in another prayer which follows, we find this language: "Give thy Holy Spirit to these persons, that they may be born again, and be made heirs of everlasting salvation."

How can it be pretended that the language of the prayer-book is framed on the supposition that the regenerating grace is bestowed before baptism? It is framed on the supposition that the regenerating grace is bestowed at, in, by, and through baptism, as the above quotations fully show.

But this is not all. Before the baptismal water is used, the minister addresses the candidates thus: "Well-beloved, who are come hither desiring to receive holy baptism, ye have heard how the congregation hath prayed, that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe *to receive you* and bless you, *to release you of your sins*," &c. Here is the prominent idea still before the mind. The candidates are *not yet* released from their sins, *not yet* regenerated, *not yet* made the children of God, and heirs of the kingdom. They are *waiting* before God, *ready* to receive "one baptism for the remission of sins."

And then, the moment water is applied, see how the whole language is changed. They are now no longer *waiting* for the blessing of regeneration and remission, —they have *received it. Now*, "these persons are regenerate;" they are "*now* born again, made heirs of everlasting salvation;" for such is the language which follows.

It only remains to be said that the offering of a prayer of consecration over the baptismal water is, as in the case of consecrating the bread and wine in the other sacrament, entirely unscriptural. This, however, is, if possible, a more *glaring* departure from scripture than

the other; for there is no passage of the word of truth which can be construed even into an *apparent* sanction of such an act. It is a practice derived from the Roman church, and not from the Bible; from the notion that water thus becomes endowed by the Spirit with power to wash away sin, and not from any just views of this christian rite. It is a practice which it is high time our church laid aside. Stretching the hands over the water, frequently dipping them into the water, and calling upon God to sanctify it to the mystical washing away of sin, has too much the appearance of heathen incantation, to be tolerated in a protestant church. I invite any person to point to the passage of scripture which directly, or even *remotely*, sanctions such a practice.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CATECHISM.

The teaching of our catechism is in complete harmony with that of the baptismal office. It starts with putting into the mouth of the child a declaration of the same general character with the strong passages I have quoted from that service. "Who gave you this name?" "My sponsors in baptism, *wherein* I was *made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.*" Being made a member of Christ must mean one of two things. It either implies, as bishop Doane affirms, that the church is Christ, so that the being made a member of one is the same thing as being made a member of the other, or that there is effected in baptism an immediate spiritual joining to Christ, beside the outward joining to the church. Either interpretation gives the passage the strongest sense it is capable of receiving. "Child of God," is also as strong an expression as our language admits. All allow that one in whom a spiritual change has *not* been effected, is, though baptized, a child of the devil, and not a "child of God." Hence the language is either false, or it implies that a spiritual change is wrought in baptism.

"How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his church?"

"Two only, as generally necessary to salvation."

The peculiar phraseology of this answer is generally overlooked. It always carried to my mind the force of the declaration, that though Christ has established several sacraments in his church, yet he has estab-

lished but two *as generally necessary to salvation.* Let the order of the sentence be changed, and the meaning will be more apparent, thus—"As generally necessary to salvation, two only." There is not the shadow of a doubt in my mind that such a meaning was *intended* by the compilers of the liturgy. It is in exact harmony with the teaching of the homilies, as adduced in the third chapter of part first. Matrimony is there called a sacrament; and it is contended that there are other sacraments beside baptism and the Lord's supper, but it is said they are not *such* sacraments as these; that is, we may presume, they are unlike these in *not being necessary to salvation*, as well as in other particulars. Bishop Taylor, one of the greatest, if not the very greatest man the English church ever produced, takes the same view. In a passage already quoted, he says: "It is none of the doctrine of the church of England, that there are two sacraments only; but that those rituals commanded in scripture, which the ecclesiastical use calls sacraments, (by a word of art,) two only are generally necessary to salvation."

"What meanest thou by this word *sacrament?*"

"I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

"How many parts are there in a sacrament?"

"Two; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace."

"What is the outward visible sign or form in baptism?"

"Water; wherein the person is baptized," &c.

"What is the inward and spiritual grace?"

"A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness."

It will be observed here, that the first assertion above declares a sacrament to be merely "an outward and visible *sign*." Thus far, I presume, no one would attempt to convict the catechism of error. Baptism *is*, undoubtedly, an outward *sign* — a sign *of* something inward and spiritual, — not the inward and spiritual *thing itself*, but the *sign* of it; for if, in the language of bishop Eastburn, "the sign becomes the thing which it signifies, where is the sign?"

But the catechism, I am sorry to say, does not rest here. It proceeds, as the reader will see from the above extracts, to contradict its own simple definition of a sacrament. Having pronounced a sacrament to be an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and unseen grace, it proceeds at once to say that it is *both* the sign *and* the thing signified. One of these definitions must be incorrect. If a sacrament is correctly defined to be a sign of grace, then it cannot be the sign and the grace both. If it be true that it is both the sign *and* the grace, then it is not correct to define it as merely an outward sign *of* inward grace.

It is very evident that the last definition of a sacrament was the one which was intended to be adopted, and the one, in fact, which is in harmony with the introductory sentences of the catechism; and it cannot escape the reader's notice that it presents a sacrament in a light as strong as any tractarian can desire; for, if a sacrament consist of the sign *and* the grace, then there is no perfect sacrament where the "inward and spiritual grace" is not conveyed; that is to say, there is no baptism, unless "*hereby*" spiritual regeneration is effected.

Besides, if baptism consist of both the outward sign and the inward grace, then the inward grace, or spiritual renovation, is as necessarily a part of baptism as

the outward sign; and our evangelical men who interpret the strong language of the baptismal service as meaning no more than an outward change, not only overlook the well-known opinions of the compilers of the liturgy, but subvert the very *nature of a sacrament*, robbing it of its most important part, namely, its internal grace. They are doing a work similar to that of the philosopher who should declare that the soul is not an essential part of man; for if the sacrament be composed of the "outward form" and the "spiritual grace," the latter is as much more important than the former, as the soul of man is more important than his body, and as much more essential to the *being* of a sacrament, as the soul is more essential than the body to the being of man.

So far as the sacraments are concerned, the dividing line between truth and error is now, I think, fairly under the eye of the reader, and he is brought to a point where he must decide for himself, whether a sacrament is composed of "*two* parts," or of only *one;* whether it is merely an outward sign, or whether in its essential nature it includes both the sign and the thing signified.* If he decide in favor of the first defi-

* The true protestant idea of a sacrament, as I conceive, is, that it is a simple rite, symbolizing a great truth. The Roman idea is, that it is a mysterious instrument, which, in the hands of a divinely-commissioned priest, works miraculous and supernatural changes in the soul. The former idea necessarily confines its nature to a unit, making it consist of but one part, — a simple symbol or "sign" of what God does in the soul; the latter gives it a dual character, making it mysteriously enfold and convey the inner grace along with the outer sign. Hence the sign becomes not only the means whereby the inner grace is received, but when it is set as a signet upon the brow, it stands there as "a *pledge* to assure us" that the grace is received. This whole question in dispute, therefore, may be made to turn on the question whether a sacrament has two parts or but one.

It has been objected that any duty in which a christian can engage — such as prayer, for example — has two parts — the outward form, and the blessing attending it. The criticism is a trifling one; but it has been made, and I answer it by saying, that, in the case of the

nition, then he rejects the opinion of our reformers, sets aside our baptismal office and catechism, and *in view of the teaching of these*, subverts the nature of a sacrament. If he take the latter definition, namely, that a sacrament has two parts, he puts himself into harmony with the offices of his church, to be sure, but he virtually joins hands with the supporters of tractarian views, and gives his support to the first principle of a merely sacramental theology. He must take his choice—either embrace the views of the offices and catechism, and be a tractarian; or admit that the prayer-book teaches error, and, rejecting its teaching, embrace such protestant doctrines as he finds revealed in the word of God.

sacrament, the "inward and spiritual grace" is supposed to be *a part of the sacrament itself*, and to be conveyed to the soul in the administration of the sacrament; whereas, in the other case, prayer comes *from the soul* and ascends to God, while the answering grace is from God, and descends upon the soul. Prayer and the answer of prayer are distinct and separate things, and cannot be two parts of the same thing.

CHAPTER V.

OFFICE FOR THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

The first rubric which stands at the beginning of this service reads thus: "Here is to be noted, that the office ensuing is not to be used for any unbaptized adults, any who die excommunicate, or who have laid violent hands upon themselves."

The observing reader will see in this rubric a recognition of the same general principle which runs through the office of baptism and the catechism. It implies that baptism, being the cause, or instrument of spiritual regeneration, is to be taken as the only evidence of christian character, or of the state of regeneration and adoption. For why are all, except the baptized, excluded from christian burial, unless for the reason that no others are christians?

That such is a true inference appears very plain from the passages of scripture, expressive of christian triumph, with which the service opens; passages most beautifully adapted to the occasion of committing the body of the true believer to the ground, but shockingly inappropriate and revolting when used at the burial of a baptized drunkard or infidel. But our church makes no distinction. At the grave of the one, as at the grave of the other, she bids her ministers repeat in triumph, "I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." I know a person may quibble, and say there is no positive declaration that the departed, over whom the language is pronounced, is a

believer in Jesus, and "shall never die;" but I should not envy that person his clearness of perception, to whose mind such a meaning was not obviously conveyed by the whole scope of the service; or the fairness of one, who, perceiving this obvious meaning, should attempt to evade it in the way just named.*

This general sentiment, of which I have spoken, is particularly apparent in the latter part of the service. "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, in his wise providence, to take out of this world the soul of our deceased *brother*, we therefore commit his body to the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; *looking for the general resurrection in the last day, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord Jesus Christ;* at whose second coming in glorious majesty to judge the world, the earth and the sea shall give up their dead; and the corruptible bodies of those who sleep in him shall be changed, and made like unto his glorious body; according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." "I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, from henceforth *blessed are the dead who die in the Lord;* even so saith the Spirit; for *they rest from their labors.*" "Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those who depart hence in the Lord; and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity; *we give thee hearty*

* Calamy reports that the celebrated Dr. Tillotson having frankly owned in a sermon, that the dissenters had some plausible objections against the common prayer, archbishop Sancroft sent for him to reprimand him. The doctor stood to what he had asserted. The archbishop asked him what parts of the common prayer he meant. He mentioned the burial service. Upon which the archbishop owned to him, that he was so little satisfied with that office himself, that for that very reason he had never taken a cure of souls. — Vol. i., p. 226.

thanks for the good example of all those thy servants, who, having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labors." "O merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the resurrection and the life; in whom whosoever believeth shall live, though he die, and whosoever liveth and believeth in him shall not die eternally, who also hath taught us, by his holy apostle, St. Paul, *not to be sorry, as men without hope*, for those who sleep *in him*," &c.

That all these sublime exultations, thanksgivings, and ascriptions of praise, should be employed in a general way, and with no reference to the person committed to the ground, is not to be supposed. They have no meaning, unless they are applicable to the occasions on which they are used. And as our church uses them all at the burial of every *baptized* person, forbidding their use at the interment of every *unbaptized* individual, the inference seems quite clear, that she regards all baptized persons, not excommunicated, nor destroyed by their own hands, as having "finished their course in faith," as dying "in the Lord," and bids us, in their case, "not to be sorry as men without hope." In short, it is a complete carrying out of the teachings of the baptismal service and the catechism; for since, according to these, men are, in baptism, "born again" by "spiritual regeneration," made the "children of God," and "heirs of the kingdom of heaven;" the burial office but finishes the system, by sending them to heaven when they die, without distinction.

CHAPTER VI.

ORDINATION OFFICE.

It is well known that those who entertain the high views of the sacraments which we have seen to be put forth by the framers of our offices, usually urge extraordinary claims in behalf of ministerial power and authority. The exaltation of the sacraments has ever been the immediate causal antecedent of the lifting up of the clerical powers and claims. This, however, is a philosophical view of the subject, which falls into a subsequent part of this work, and which I can use here only as a connecting link with which to preserve unbroken the chain of my argument, and to fasten those parts of the prayer-book which bring to view the functions and powers of the ministry, to those just considered, which unfold the alleged nature and efficacy of the sacraments.

It is plain that the English reformers entertained extravagant opinions respecting the powers of the christian ministry. Hooker, in his great work, has embodied this extravagance thus: "The power of the ministry of God translateth out of darkness into glory; it raiseth man from the earth, and *bringeth God himself from heaven;* [that is, as the context shows, it brings Christ down from heaven, and joins him to the elements of bread and wine;] *by blessing visible elements, it maketh them invisible graces; it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; it hath to dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of the world, and the blood which was poured out to redeem souls; when it poureth maledictions upon the heads of the wicked, they perish;*

when it revoketh the same, they revive." Extravagant as this language is, it is no more so than the view of the sacraments presented in the prayer-book will justify. For, if the ministry, by invoking the power of the Holy Ghost upon the bread and wine, can so change them, "that" we may receive the body and blood of Christ by "*receiving them;*" if the clergy have the command of the Spirit, so as at all times, whether in a holy or an unholy frame of mind, to procure such a consecration of water that it shall mystically wash away sin; if they hold in their hands the keys of the kingdom in such a sense that by administering baptism they may admit whomsoever they will, making them "members of Christ," "children of God," and "heirs of the kingdom of heaven," committing all such to the ground when they die, in a joyful looking for the resurrection from the dead,—at the same time excluding all unbaptized persons from christian burial, as though nothing save the water they had consecrated *could* wash away sin, and fit the soul for heaven;—if such things may be done by the ministry, then Hooker is right in saying, "It translateth out of darkness into glory," and "raiseth man from the earth;" then he cannot be far out of the way when he says, those "perish" upon whom "it poureth maledictions," and "revive" when "it revoketh the same." And then, especially, the reader will be prepared to listen without surprise to the language of the bishop, when, in the act of ordination, he lays his hands upon the head of the person to be ordained, and says, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

This is certainly in harmony with what has gone before. If the *presbyter* can consecrate water so that it shall wash away sin; if *he* can bring down Christ from heaven, and so mysteriously mix his spiritual nature with bread and wine as to change "visible elements" into "invisible graces,"—it is surely no marvel that the *bishop* can give "the Holy Ghost" to whom he will, even though he use the imperative word—"receive." If the *presbyter* "hath to dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of the world," it is not strange that the *bishop* may have the Holy Ghost to dispose of with equal freedom. We are obliged, therefore, to regard the teaching of the ordination office as a faithful carrying out, or more properly, a genuine development, of the high sacramental views which lie just behind it in the communion, baptismal, and burial offices, and in the catechism. However little of gospel truth there may be, therefore, in this part of the ordination office, and however little light it may throw upon any sound system of christian theology, it throws backward a considerable amount of interpretative light, so to speak, upon the portions of the prayer-book already considered; and under the guidance of this light, the reader is requested to run his thoughts back over the arguments adduced in favor of the strong and obvious sense put upon those parts of the common prayer. When this is done, he will be ready for the inquiry, whether the portion of the ordinal quoted above can be otherwise regarded than as expressive of an unsound and dangerous assumption of episcopal power.

The words of the ordinal, to which objection is now made, are the same with those used by our Saviour to his disciples, when he came suddenly to them,

and, breathing on them, said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," &c.*

The inquiry which here naturally springs to the mind is, Did our Lord intend this as an act of ordination? Of course it would not become me to say he did not. Yet to my mind, there are certainly very reasonable doubts hanging over the question. If it were an ordination, the apostles who were ordained did not appear conscious of the fact; for when Thomas came in, they had nothing to say to him of any ordination, but merely told him they had seen the Lord. Moreover, if the apostles then received their ministerial commission, it does not appear that Thomas was ordained, for he was absent, and there is no account of his being ordained at any other time.

But if there is no evidence that this was an ordination, then it is certainly incongruous, to say the least, to take words which were employed on another occasion, and for another purpose, and use them in an ordination service as the formula for expressing the conveyance of the ministerial commission.

At all events, whatever was the object of this particular act, it is evident that Christ alone has power to bestow the Holy Ghost. I object to this part of the service, then, on three grounds. 1. There is no evidence that this was an ordination, and it is therefore improper to use these words on such an occasion. 2. Granting it to be an ordination, it then follows that the bishops ought to *breathe* upon those whom they ordain, and omit all those words in the ordinal not used by Christ, in order to make their imitation of him at all *consistent*. 3. It is the next thing to blasphemy, to attempt to imitate Christ in the bestowment of the

* John xx. 22, 23.

Holy Ghost, whatever the particular significance of the act he performed when he found the disciples alone.

There are three senses in which the words, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted," &c., may be understood. First, the absolute sense, which implies the full power to forgive sins—a power which practically embodies itself in the phrase—"I absolve thee from all thy sins." Of course, no person could be invested with this power, unless he were endowed with the gift of discerning spirits. Speaking of what our Lord said to his disciples, Matthew Henry remarks, —"In the strict sense, this is a *special commission* to the apostles themselves, and the first preachers of the gospel, who could distinguish who were in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity, and who were not. By virtue of this power, Peter struck Ananias and Sapphira dead, and Paul struck Elymas blind." Secondly, these words may have the more general meaning, that the ministers of the gospel are authorized to declare to every man, that if he repents, his sins are forgiven, and if he does not repent, that his sins are retained and treasured up against him. Thirdly, they may mean that all penitent persons whom the apostles should admit into church fellowship, on gospel terms, God would admit into fellowship with himself.

If the first of these senses is true at all, it is of course true only of the apostles and early heralds of the gospel, or those of them who were not only endowed with the general gifts of the Spirit, but with the special gift of the "discerning of spirits."* The second and the third, then, are the only senses in

*1 Cor. xii. 10.

which they can be applicable to ministers at the present day; and hence they can be unobjectionable only when separated from the words which imply some miraculous gift of the Spirit. To use them in connection with the words—"Receive ye the Holy Ghost," is to give them the sense which the Roman Catholic attaches to them, and to expose those who thus employ them to the just rebuke and censure of a protestant community.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DECLARATION OF ABSOLUTION.

In close doctrinal alliance with the ordination office, stands "The declaration of absolution or remission of sins." The latter is but an attempted arrangement for a constant exercise of the power said to be conferred in ordination. The presbyter, having been told at his ordination that he has the power of forgiving sins, finds here, prepared to his hands, a formula of words, in which he is to exercise this extraordinary function; and accordingly he rises from his knees, at the end of the first prayer or general confession,—the people remaining in the kneeling posture,—and says—"Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live, *hath given* POWER *and* COMMANDMENT *to his ministers to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins.*"

In order to meet fairly and honestly the logical sequence of this annunciation, he ought now to go on and say—I, therefore, in obedience to this "command," and in virtue of this "power," do "declare and pronounce" a full remission and absolution of all your sins,—so that you are hereby entirely acquitted in the sight of God. But instead of this straight-forward acceptance of an inference fairly flowing from the premises announced, he is made to shrink away in a cowardly manner, and to take up the mere christian truism, that GOD "pardoneth and absolveth all those who truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy

gospel;" and to turn the whole thing almost into a burlesque, by beginning to exhort the people, "Let *us* beseech him to grant *us* true repentance, and his Holy Spirit," &c.

This declaration of absolution appears to be fairly exposed to several objections.

1. The first objection is, that the introductory language is too strong. It implies a power of absolving from sin more absolute than any man can possess who is not endowed with the gift of discerning spirits; and as that gift has not been bestowed since apostolic times, the language is inadmissible.

2. In the second place, it is illogical, as I have shown above,—compelling the minister to shrink from the fair conclusion of his own premises, and, instead of exercising his asserted right to absolve, to declare merely what any christian in the assembly might declare, namely, that God forgives the sins of penitent persons.

3. The third objection to this form of absolution is, that the minister having been first compelled to announce his power to declare and pronounce absolution, and God's "*command*" that he should do so, and then having *disappointed* the naturally excited expectation in the minds of the people that he is about to exercise the consoling power upon them,—he is obliged still further to confuse them, by abruptly bringing them back upon an equality with himself, and exhorting them to join with him in mutual prayer, that God would bestow upon them both, what he had just declared himself empowered and commanded to pronounce upon them, namely, absolution from sin.

4. The next objection to this part of the service is, that it is not what it professes to be; that is, it is not a declaration of absolution. In the words of bishop

White, "Although it affirms a certain authority in the speaker, he is not made to exercise the authority on those before him, however possessed of necessary requisites." He rises from his knees, and in a formal manner makes known his authority to do a certain thing, but, notwithstanding the expectation he has raised, does not do it; and when he gets through, he may be said to have declared and pronounced his *authority* — nothing more.

5. Another, and, if possible, a more serious objection to this part of the service, is, that it bears so strikingly the marks and lineaments of that Janus-faced policy which smiles in one direction upon Romanists, and in another upon protestants. I showed, in a former chapter, that the English reformation was conducted, in part, on the compromise principle; and here we have an example of an attempt to preserve that "*external*" *papal* "*face of things*," of which Burnet speaks, which was supposed to have so potent an influence "to draw the people more entirely into the reformation;" with the general impression, we presume, that as they "are apt to judge," as he further states, "in things of ignorance, by outward *appearances* more than by the real *value* of things; so the *preserving an exterior, that looked somewhat like what they had been formerly accustomed to, had a great effect at first on many persons, who, without that, could not have been easily brought over to adhere to the work.*" The calling this part of the service a "declaration of absolution, or remission of sins," together with the minister's rising up, and announcing that God has given him power to declare and pronounce absolution and remission, would all have to the minds of the people the "*external face*" and appearance of that to which "they had been formerly accustomed," that is to Ro-

manism itself; while the illogical and abrupt slide into something bearing no resemblance to an exercise of the power of absolution, would avail to satisfy the consciences of many protestants. The whole aspect of the thing admirably illustrates the remark, as already quoted, of the bishops belonging to the commission appointed by Charles II. to revise the liturgy, namely, "It was the wisdom of our reformers to draw up such a liturgy *as neither Romanist nor protestant could well except against.*" *

At quite an early period, there began to appear in the christian church a disposition to dramatize the several parts of christian worship; that is, to embody certain general hints thrown out in the Scriptures in specific formulas, and to repeat them before the congregation, accompanying them with theatrical acts and gesticulations, intended to illustrate and give them significance. To this general tendency, the other form of absolution, which is precatory in its nature, owes its origin. Christ had given to his ministers the authority to declare in general terms the forgiveness of all who should receive the gospel, repent of sins, and live a holy life; and the authority, too, to tell any individual man who inquired the way of salvation, that, on the condition of repentance and faith, he should be forgiven. But the early church, not contented with any general exercise of the power, attempted, in its dramatizing zeal, as often as each recurrence of divine worship, formally to *act it out*, and in a way which was never, we may presume, intended by our Lord.

Possibly, indeed not unlikely, the desire to make the sinner dependent on the ministry for salvation, to shut him up to the necessity of receiving divine grace

* Dr. Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences, &c., p. 338.

through that channel, to lay him prostrate at the feet of the priesthood as an humble beggar for admission into the kingdom of heaven, may have had something to do with the attempt to give particular *form*, and regularly recurring *prominence* to an alleged absolving power. Certain it is that it is well fitted to encourage the worst forms of spiritual despotism.

The word "priest," as it occurs in the rubric which precedes the first form of absolution, is worthy of some attention. It evidently throws some light on the general design and intent of this part of the service. This was, at the Savoy conference, substituted in the place of "minister." The Presbyterian divines who attended the conference requested,—a very reasonable request,—that the word minister might be used throughout the book of common prayer. But the bishops said there were some offices which a deacon might not perform, "particularly the absolution and consecration," and that it was necessary to preserve the word priest to distinguish the powers of the two orders. They, therefore, not only refused to make the requested alteration, but struck the word minister out of this rubric, and inserted the word priest. It cannot be pleaded, therefore, that the word is here used carelessly, and is intended to mean no more than minister. It is avowedly employed to signify that higher grade of the clergy who have the power to *consecrate*, that is, to consecrate bread and wine, to make them "holy;" who have the power, in the language of Hooker, "to bring down God from heaven;"—that is, the God-man, Christ,—and so to mingle his nature with the bread and wine, that the "visible elements" shall become "invisible graces;" who have the power, therefore, to make a *sacrifice* in the eucharist, and who are *priests* in the true primary sense of the term.

Besides, as they are called priests here in order to distinguish them from the order of deacons, and to exclude the deacon from the right of pronouncing absolution, it follows that the absolving power here set forth is intended to be something more absolute than a general proclamation of pardon through faith: for *this*, a deacon might make as well as a priest. That is to say, the deacon *may* declare from the pulpit that God will forgive every penitent sinner; but he *may not* pronounce this absolution from the desk; *therefore* this declaration is understood by our church to be something more than any such general declaration. Of this view of the subject I have never seen even an attempted answer.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CALENDAR.

The chapter on the homilies created, when published in the Christian Alliance, a considerable feeling; and much of this feeling arose, as I have reason to believe, from the exposure there made of a full recognition in the homilies of the apocrypha as a part of the inspired Scriptures. It was clear that such a recognition *was there;* and it was equally clear, of course, that it was not put there by the writer of these pages. He was blamed, therefore, for *exposing* that recognition; that is, for publishing a *fact*, a fact which is not denied, and which cannot be denied.

It has been denied, however, that our church, in its *higher* standard, namely, the prayer-book, makes any such recognition. It has been said that, "in the worst aspect of the case, it would appear that the church has declared, by her most authoritative standard, that the apocrypha is *not*, and by a standard of lower authority, that it *is*, a part of the canon of Scripture."

Were I to grant the truth of this remark, it would only help me to establish the main position at which I aim throughout these pages, namely, that our church is inconsistent with itself, — that it is not *everywhere* clear and distinct in its enunciations of truth — that it mingles with its shining protestant gold a hurtful and debasing alloy of Romanism.

But even this cannot be admitted. The apocrypha is recognized as a part of "holy Scripture" by the "higher authority," also, namely, the prayer-book.

The rubric which stands before the calendar of lessons for the year, reads thus: "The order how the rest of the *holy Scripture* is appointed to be read." Under this general designation of "holy Scripture," I find no less than *eighteen lessons selected from the apocrypha*. In the best aspect of the case, therefore, our church recognizes the apocrypha as "holy Scripture" in the prayer-book and homilies, and denies it to be such in the articles.*

Now, it is well known that these apocryphal lessons in the calendar were one of the prominent grounds of the puritan protest. They have not stood there, like obsolete laws upon the statute book, which do neither good nor harm, because nobody knows anything about them. For more than a hundred years, the attention of the English church was continually drawn to them by an unceasing protest. They were known to be the means of bringing much scandal upon the church, and to be the occasion of driving many excellent men out of it. And yet there they stood, labelled "holy Scripture," and sanctioned as such by the prayer-book, the church's "most authoritative standard."

It would be difficult to conjecture why these lessons were not thrown out of the calendar at the revision of the prayer-book by the Protestant Episcopal church in this country. That was a favorable opportunity for clearing itself of a reproach justly resting upon it. Such an amendment might have been easily made. Nothing was needed but to drop a few spurious lessons out of the calendar, and to insert a few in their place taken from what is in truth "holy Scripture." Who can tell why it was not done? Nay, who can tell why it has not been done since? why a single session of the

* The articles, I need hardly say, are separate things from the prayer-book; though bound up with it, they make no part of it.

general convention is allowed to pass without the needed correction? While these lessons remain, does not our church stand before the christian world in a very *equivocal* position, to say the least?

Regard this matter as lightly as men will; treat this exposure with as much severity as they please; the protestantism of no church will or can pass current and unsuspected, while it reckons the apocrypha as a part of God's word.

PART IV.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENT.

CERTAIN USAGES SANCTIONED AND USED BY THE EPISCOPAL CHURCHES OF ENGLAND AND AMERICA, WHICH NECESSARILY, ON PHILOSOPHICAL PRINCIPLES, BEGET ROMISH VIEWS, AND ROMISH FEELINGS.

CHAPTER I.

USAGES WHICH IMPLY AND TEACH FALSE DOCTRINE.

The general subject announced above as the topic of discussion in this part of the work, very naturally divides itself into two parts; the first of which embraces all those usages, employed by our church, which teach, by implication, any of the false doctrines of Rome; the second, comprehending those which do *not* teach or imply false doctrine, but which, from their resemblance to Roman practices, and the associations connected with them, do beget superstitious and Romish feelings—thus *preparing the way* for false doctrine.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the argument in this chapter, and the one to follow it, is based on the principle that drapery, arrangement, signs, actions, have a language of their own, and frequently convey a meaning as distinct and impressive as the best chosen words. This principle involves the philosophy of language, and lies at the basis of all methods of communicating thought. *Words* have no inherent capacity to express thought. They have just that meaning which usage and common consent have

attached to them, and no other. Had men so decided, there is no reason why a motion of the finger should not have signified the flesh of cattle, as well as the word beef. Indeed, one part of our fellow-creatures are entirely dependent upon signs for the communication of their thoughts. Every person, too, has heard of the theatrical entertainment called pantomime, in which the whole plot and intention of the piece is unfolded by gesticulation, without the use of words. And, indeed, the popularity of all dramatic performances depends more upon drapery and action, than upon the words repeated. Even children understand the philosophy of signs, as every teacher of youth can testify, who has had his best efforts for order defeated by electric communications across the schoolroom. Near the beginning of our service, the minister rises up, and by his "outward gesture" and manner *represents* an exercise of an alleged absolving power; and actions are so well understood to have a *meaning*, as well as words, that, although there is really no absolution pronounced, the people have, for two hundred years, let it pass as a regular absolution.

Preparatory to a fair appreciation of the following line of argument, the reader is requested to observe that several of the usages which fall under these two branches of the subject would not, perhaps, if considered singly and alone, be particularly worthy of reprehension. It is only when viewed in connection with each other, and as having a consentient voice and aim, that they become dangerous whisperers of Roman falsehood in the ears of the people. It will be, therefore, an act of egregious unfairness, when I broach one of the least important of these usages, to turn upon me, and say I am magnifying trifles. They might be trifles considered *alone;* but a multiplication of just

such trifles constitutes the paraphernalia of tractarianism, and their further multiplication completes the drapery of Romanism itself. A comma, standing alone on a plain sheet of paper, is a thing of very little significance; but place it in a row of figures, in the arrangement of units and decimals, and it becomes a character of very great importance.

Desks and Pulpits.

Nearly all the usages which imply and teach false doctrine bear with more or less directness upon the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, or upon the office and powers of the ministry. On these two points especially, the sacraments and the ministry, the English reformers failed to rid themselves of papal error. The *separation* of the pulpit and the desk; the instructing the people from one, and the offering the prayers from the other, is of itself strongly presumptive evidence that they retained erroneous notions of the ministerial character. Why does not the minister pray and preach from the same desk or pulpit? Does God hear him better from the *desk*, and the people catch the sound of his voice more perfectly from the *pulpit?* Is this mode more *convenient* than worshipping and teaching in one and the same place? Not at all. The reason lies deeper than either of these considerations. As our reformers held wrong notions of the sacraments, so they entertained erroneous opinions of the ministry. When our ritual was arranged, they had not abandoned the idea of a *priesthood* in the church of God,—a class of men not only authorized to teach the people, but to offer *sacrifices* to Jehovah, and especially to be the medium of offering to God the sacrifice of the people's prayers and praises. They regarded the clergy as a kind of mediators between

God and men; in other words, they believed in what bishop Whittingham calls a "ministerial intervention for the forgiveness of sin." They looked upon the clergy as having a double office to perform, — that of *teaching* the people, and of offering to God *sacrifices* in their behalf. And one of the most natural modes of expressing this double idea, was the double arrangement of the clergyman's arena of public duty. Having offered the prayers of the people *as a priest*, it was natural that he should take another position from which to instruct them *as a teacher*. This double character of the ministry; — its character as a body of teachers, which is scriptural and consequently true, and its character as a body of sacrificers, which is unscriptural and consequently false; — is not only suggested, but, to a philosophical mind, plainly implied, in praying in the desk and preaching in the pulpit.

The Surplice.

But not to rest so grave a charge on a single fact, however well it might sustain it, I urge that the idea of a christian *priesthood* is still further implied and taught by *wearing the surplice*. The minister not only gives a significant intimation of his double character of priest and prophet, by praying in the desk and preaching in the pulpit, but he illustrates and enforces the idea still further, by appearing in these two places in *different dresses*. White adorns him in the desk, in token that he shall offer to God for the people a *pure sacrifice*. The black gown covers him in the pulpit, it being the badge of a professional teacher. It might possibly be said, with some show of plausibility, that it is inferring a little too much to draw the false doctrine of which I speak out of a mere preaching and praying in different places, provided this were a solitary fact

standing alone; but when, in addition to this, the preacher appears in the pulpit with the scholastic gown, plainly indicative of his character as a teacher, and in the desk and at the communion table decked with a white linen surplice, resembling, intentionally, the white linen ephod of the Jewish *priest*, there can be no reasonable doubt that he is supposed to possess not merely the character of a teacher, but that of a priest. At all events, whatever may have been the intention of the compilers of our ritual, the change of place in performing the different parts of clerical duty, and the corresponding change of dress, do necessarily, to a philosophical mind, convey such an idea; and, in searching for the causes which produce sacramentarianism,—called at the present time Puseyism,—I may safely charge these usages as being fruitful sources of wrong ideas in regard to the ministry. When the tendency is towards a sacramental theology, of which a *priesthood* is an essential element, it is plain that these usages must have their due influence in creating the *doctrine* of a priesthood.*

* Aside from the false teaching growing out of the use of the surplice, a well-grounded objection has often been urged to a *change* from one vestment to another during divine service. I would not press unimportant things; but I frankly confess it has always appeared to me a frivolous trifling with God's worship, for him who conducts it to break its order and solemnity, by retiring, like a stage performer, to an adjoining room, to change his vestment from white to black. At the moment when the minister's thoughts should be lifted into communion with the highest and holiest contemplations, when the big and overpowering convictions of his responsibilities should be pressing, like mountains, upon his soul, what solemn mockery to send him away into a lobby on the trifling and childish errand of getting a robe of another color to show the congregation! Singing is a part of the worship of God's house; and I have yet to learn that the minister can with propriety absent himself for the purpose of readjusting his personal habiliments, while the congregation engages in it. As well might the people, while he offers prayer, retire to brush their hair and arrange their cravats, that they might present to the eyes of each other a sleek and comely appearance. As things now are, the usual invitation — "Let *us* worship God by singing," &c., should be

I speak with the more freedom on this point, because I know I am not singular in regarding the surplice as a symbolical garment. It is so considered by all Episcopalian writers, who have published anything of consequence on the subject. It has no apologist or defender who does not regard it as designed and fitted to teach something symbolically. But what is it generally supposed to teach? This is the question; and perhaps no man is better able to answer it than the learned Dr. Hopkins, the bishop of the protestant Episcopal church in the diocese of Vermont. In his work on the primitive church, having stated the reason for wearing the black dress in the pulpit, he says:

"The office appropriated to the desk, the font, and the altar, are of a different character; for they are addressed not so much to men, as to God. To him we lift the voice of prayer, to him we raise the chant of praise, to him we offer the consecrated elements, and with them present our souls and bodies in the eucharist. And, *therefore*, the putting on a white garment as a preparation for these acts of worship, is *intended* to remind us of many interesting and affecting points in the character of our holy religion."*

changed into "*You* will please to worship God," &c., as the minster has but very little to do with it, being engaged in the very important business of changing his gowns!

Another strange incongruity is that of the minister's kneeling, on his return from the vestry, to offer silent prayer, while the congregation is singing. Whether it is in accordance with the apostle's injunction, "Let all things be done decently and in order," to have the people engaged in one part of worship, and the minister in another at the same time, might safely be left to the decision of the most ordinary common sense. Certain it is, there is no mind which would not instinctively shrink from the impropriety, had it not previously been accustomed to the grosser incongruity of an absence from a part of worship for a change of dress.

* Page 160.

The bishop then goes on and states *what* it is intended to call to mind.

"It reminds us," he says, "of the robe of Christ's righteousness, the wedding garment of the Lamb of God, in which we must appear in the great day, if we would obtain justification before the eternal throne."

"It reminds us that the cleansing and purifying of the sinner depends on the blessed sacrifice of the atonement."

"It reminds us of the future glory of the redeemed."

"It reminds us, lastly, of the frame of heart with which we should approach the majesty of the eternal Sovereign. As black clothing is an expressive emblem of mourning and grief, so white clothing is an emblem of purity and joy. And what purity should he attain who is allowed to enter into the sanctuary of the God of holiness—what solemn joy should he feel who is permitted to offer, before the King of heaven, an acceptable *sacrifice of prayer and praise!*"

These statements suggest some interesting thoughts. The first reason assigned for wearing the surplice is, that the minister is, in the discharge of this part of his duty, engaged in addressing *God*, and not men. So are the *people*, in this part of the service, engaged also in addressing God; should they likewise be clad in a white linen surplice? Certainly they should, if the mere fact of addressing God, and not men, were a sufficient reason for wearing it. "To him," says bishop Hopkins, "we lift the voice of prayer." So do the people. "To him we raise the chant of praise." The people do the same. "To him we dedicate the convert in baptism." Ah, here is the difference. The dedicating of the convert's soul and body to God, as a

living sacrifice, is made *by the priest.** "To him we offer the consecrated elements." Here is another *sacrificial* act, which the people may not perform. So far, then, bishop Hopkins' reasons for wearing the surplice go to show that the minister wears it as a badge of his *priestly* character. And how it can remind one of the "robe of Christ's righteousness," and "that the cleansing and purifying of the sinner depends on this blessed sacrifice of the atonement," it is not easy to see, unless it naturally associates with itself the sacrificial idea. As white is appropriately symbolical of "joy," bishop Hopkins thinks the minister should wear it in token of joy at being permitted to offer to the "King of heaven an acceptable sacrifice of prayer and praise." We must, then, infer one of two things; either that the people ought to wear it, or that they do not offer the sacrifice of prayer and praise. As the friends of the surplice will not pretend that it ought to be worn by the people, of course they must conclude that all their prayers and praises are offered by the priest, and offered, too, in his *priestly character*, so strikingly symbolized by his white linen surplice. And, indeed, this is only a consistent carrying out of a principle announced a little before; for if the priest may dedicate to God the convert, in baptism, he may surely be the medium of offering the sacrifice of his prayers and praises.

* By looking at Rom. xii. 1, the reader will see that St. Paul directs that men should *themselves* present their souls and bodies to God. He seems to have had no idea that a mediating priest was necessary to offer them to God. God requires men to come directly to him. "Give me thy heart," is his language — not, give it to the priest, that he may give it to me. Religion is a personal matter. God must be approached directly by every man for himself. The only mediation to be thought of is that of Jesus, our great High Priest, who has passed into the heavens. And yet all the arrangements of our ritual which bear on this question of the ministry and the sacraments, involve more or less clearly the idea of a ministerial intervention.

Giving the Bread.

The Roman Catholic priest puts the wafer *into the mouth* of the communicant. This indicates the dependence of the latter upon the former, for an instrumental or mediatorial conveyance of grace. The minister, in our denomination, imitating in part the Roman priest, takes the piece of bread, and places it *in the hand* of the communicant. I object to this, on the ground that it implies a ministerial power to impart grace. It suggests the idea that the clergyman has something to give, and the communicant something to *receive from him.** It obtrudes upon the observing mind the oft-recurring idea of a "ministerial invention." The communicants go to the table of their Lord, to *feed*, not *to be fed* by the priest; to take the bread of life for themselves, not to have it given to them by another mortal. Anything is exceptionable, however apparently trifling, which helps to place the ministry between God and the soul, or which in any way obscures the idea of a direct communication with the Father of spirits. The act of taking a single piece of bread, and placing it in the hand of each communicant, viewed in connection with the fact that the bread has been previously consecrated and made "holy," and also with the fact that it has to be done at the expense of what, on other occasions, would be considered the plainest requirements of politeness, (for what gentleman, at an ordinary meal, would think of putting a piece of bread into the hand of another?) is certainly fitted to *suggest* a false idea; and who does not know that the mind often receives and settles down

* It will perhaps be objected that Christ, having broken the bread, *gave* it to his disciples; but I ask if the ordinary method of passing bread does not answer to this account as well?

upon principles which it learns only through suggestions. Satan seldom broaches a falsehood in a direct and open manner. If he can keep the mind quiet, and familiarize it to the repeated suggestion of what is untrue, he is well contented to bide his time, and wait for the issue.

Arrangement of Chancels.

A priesthood would be an anomaly without an altar. Hence, our reformers have not preserved one without the other. The implied idea of an altar, so plainly preserved in our ritual, seems for some time to have slept. Recently, however, it has come out with new prominence; and has found a mute but emphatic expression, in the modern arrangement of chancels.

It has become quite common to put the pulpit at one end of the chancel, or near the corner of the church, and the reading desk at the other.* The design of this seems to be to make room for the *altar*. Whenever a thing increases in magnitude and importance, it always wants more room. A mere communion-table is well enough accommodated in front of the reading-desk, or even behind the pulpit against the wall. It is a very unambitious, and consequently unostentatious thing. It is contented with the most obscure position, and is satisfied, even if not seen at all. But the moment it becomes an altar, on which a sacrifice is offered, it ceases to be unassuming, and claims to be the most important thing in the church. Then it becomes the

* By this arrangement, the minister is made to address his congregation *diagonally*, or obliquely; and it is a fact which ought to excite no surprise, that where this practice is adopted, the style of presenting christian doctrine often becomes similarly diagonal and oblique. For when there is a desire to make the pulpit and the desk stand out of the way of the altar, it is not singular that the doctrine of justification by faith only should begin to give place to an alleged inherent and sacramental righteousness.

particular spot where God appears to meet his people, and where an unbloody sacrifice is offered for their sins. Then it is the visible shechinah, the local dwelling-place of the Deity. Then it can admit of no obscuration. It must stand in open view of the whole congregation. Pulpits and reading-desks must meekly retire, and be content to stand, each in a corner, against the wall.

If this is not in substance the meaning of such an arrangement of desks and pulpits, I must plead ignorance of what it does mean. It certainly has the *appearance* of an attempt to give prominence and sacredness to the table of the Lord. The pulpit and desk seem to be taken out of the way that they may not overshadow or obscure this intentionally prominent object.

Praying towards the Table.

That part of our service called morning prayer, the minister performs in the reading-desk. At the close of this he usually comes out and reads the ante-communion service at the right-hand side of the communion-table. I observe that the great majority of our clergy, —the evangelical men as well as the high churchmen, —stand with their faces to the people when reading the commandments, the gospel and epistle, and the psalms and hymns; but turn their faces directly to the communion-table during the offering of each prayer, though they often stand while offering it, and are not obliged to turn for the convenience of kneeling. Now there is of course some *reason* for this. It is an act too singular in its character not to mean something. When a minister has read the commandments with his face to the people, he certainly would not whirl suddenly round to the table to offer a prayer of six

lines in length, unless there was some special reason for it. If the table be a simple *table*, and no more holy than any other part of the church, this would certainly be a very meaningless change of position; but if it be an *altar*, a holy thing, a thing from whose awe-inspiring presence the pulpit and the reading-desk must retire into opposite corners; if it be the shechinah of the christian church, the place where God is locally present; *then* we see at once why prayer must be offered in that direction. If the altar be the place where God is specially present, then there is the place to address him; if he be everywhere alike "in his holy temple," then one would suppose the minister might as well address him with his face towards the congregation as towards the table. And, however unconscious clergymen may be of the fact, I venture the opinion that those who practise this significant change of position are generally prompted to it by a real, though, perhaps, unconfessed feeling of reverence for the "holy table,"—some hidden (hidden, perhaps, from themselves) apprehension of God's peculiarly mysterious manifestation there.*

Kneeling at the Communion.

It has never been doubted, I believe, that at the institution of the supper, our Saviour and his disciples *reclined* at the table in the same manner as when

* My readers will many of them remember how much was said in the Episcopal papers respecting the Rev. Mr. Croswell, when he started the new church of the Advent in this city, and read the psalter and offered the prayers with his back to the people. In *principle* the turning to the table, in the manner spoken of above, is precisely the same with Mr. Croswell's practice. This has been suggested by Mr. Croswell's friends, and I have heard it scouted at as though it were not worthy of notice; but those who treat it thus scornfully would be sadly puzzled to answer it—nor do I believe they would like to undertake to show a difference before a discriminating public.

taking a common meal. It is *scriptural*, then, to take this sacrament in the same position in which we receive our meals.

But the Roman church teaches her people that the bread and wine, upon the pronouncing of the consecration prayer by the priest, are changed into the real body and blood of Christ, and that a whole Christ, — including body, soul, and divinity, — is present under the outward form of bread and wine; and hence she teaches them, still further, that this Christ ought to be worshipped, and that kneeling, in token of adoration, is the proper position in which to receive the sacrament.

So necessarily does this act of kneeling indicate worship of the elements, or rather of the Christ supposed to be concealed under the elements, that the earlier reformers thought it necessary to place a rubric before the communion service, declaring that, by kneeling, "no adoration was intended to any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." This rubric was subsequently left out, with the view, bishop Burnet says, of letting the question of Christ's corporal presence lie open, as an unsettled question. The rubric was afterwards inserted again in the English prayer-book, but it is not in ours.

It is very evident that a person may kneel to receive the communion without intending or feeling any homage towards the elements; and of course in the breast of all true protestants there is an absence of such a feeling. But when there is a tendency to the exaltation of the sacraments, the question is, whether this reverential mode of receiving the bread and wine will not help on the tendency; and whether the receiving of them in the usual posture of taking a common meal, after the example of our Lord and his apostles, would

not of itself go far to *prevent* any idea of a change in them, by preventing the exercise of reverential feelings towards them. I think a true philosophy will not be long in deciding this question. It seems to me that the feelings appropriate to be excited at the communion table are *joy* and *gratitude*, not *reverence* and *adoration*. We go to the table of the Lord, not reverentially to *worship*, but joyfully to *commemorate* the glorious work which Christ has done for us. The feeling of reverence does not appear to be the one which the occasion is intended to excite. The reverential posture would appear, therefore, to be inappropriate. A kneeling to take the elements certainly implies a reverential feeling towards them.*

Consecrations.

When describing the manner in which the English reformers set themselves to purge out the superstitious practices of the church, bishop Burnet† says:

"In the search of the former offices, they found an infinite deal of superstition in the consecrations of water, salt, bread, incense, candles, fire, bells, churches, images, altars, crosses, vessels, garments, palms, flowers; all looked like the rites of heathenism, and seemed to spring from the same fountain. When the water or salt were blessed, it was expressed to be to this end, that they might be health both to soul and body; and devils, who might well laugh at these tricks which they had taught them, were abjured not to come to any place where they were sprinkled; and the holy bread was blessed,

* One would suppose that the example of Christ and his apostles would be sufficient to condemn the practice of kneeling, without any reasoning to show its evil tendency. Alas! as this example does not avail to correct the error, I fear my argument will stand but little chance of producing conviction.

† Hist. Ref., vol. ii., p. 117.

to be a defence against all diseases and snares of the devil; and the holy incense, that devils might not come near the smoke of it, but that all who smelled at it might perceiv : the virtue of the Holy Ghost; and the ashes were blessed, so that all who were covered with them might deserve to obtain the remission of their sins. All these things had drawn the people to such confidence in them, that they generally thought without those harder terms of true holiness, they might, upon such superstitious observances, be sure of heaven. So all these they resolved to cast out as things which had no warrant in scripture, and were vain devices to draw men from a lively application to God through Christ, according to the method of the gospel."

It has been already proved that the reformers entertained a commendable resolution to dismiss all needless ceremonies, as here stated by Burnet, but that they were hindered by Elizabeth from *completing* the work. The *most* of these extremely superstitious consecrations they did indeed put away; but they did not go to the extent of banishing *all* that were unscriptural. Consecrating the baptismal water, we have already said, has no warrant in the Bible. Consecrating the bread and wine has as little. "When the water or salt were blessed," says Burnet "it was expressed to be to this end, that they might be health both to soul and body;" and is not the water said, in our baptismal service, to be sanctified that it may mystically wash away sin? and are not the bread and wine said to be consecrated, "*that*" we, by receiving them, may receive the body and blood of Christ? So far as the blessing, the consecrating, or the sanctifying are concerned, we have certainly retained the essence of the Roman superstition,—a superstition which, Burnet says, is not

merely the offspring of heathenism, but which retains the marks and evidences of its paternity.

Significant Manipulations.

The heathen origin of these consecrations appears more evident when we consider the gestures and manipulations employed in connection with them. Much of the significance of heathen rites is made to consist in gesticulation. So, in performing our baptismal service, many of our ministers are in the habit of spreading their hands over the water, and some dip them into it when they invoke the sanctification which is to fit it for washing away sin. And in the communion service, while reciting the account of the institution, the direction for the minister is, "Here the priest is to take the paten into his hands." "And here to break the bread." "And here to lay his hands upon all the bread." "Here he is to take the cup into his hands." "And here he is to lay his hands upon every vessel in which there is any wine to be consecrated." Thus it is all acted out, as if the precious gifts of the Spirit, almost impiously supposed to be called down upon the elements, were distilled from the ends of his fingers. Who is so little acquainted with the philosophy of signs as not to know that such gestures have all the force of the most explicit words; that they are *too full* of meaning to find any verbal utterance? Who does not see that our baptismal service and communion service,—especially the latter,—are highly dramatic? that they talk to the eye as well as to the ear? that they have intelligible signs as well as explicit words? that they speak the language of the deaf mute as well as that of the hearing and talking man? that they present the expressive pantomime to the eye as well as the clear recitation to the ear?

Eating and Drinking what remain.

Our communion office closes with this rubric: "And if any of the consecrated bread and wine remain after the communion, it shall not be carried out of the church; but the minister and other communicants shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same."

Let it be observed here that it is the "*consecrated* bread and wine" only which are not to be carried out of the church, and that they are to be retained and "*reverently*" eat and drank, *because* they are consecrated.* What is the meaning of this? What other meaning can it have than this, namely, that *consecration* has given to the elements a holiness which must not be lost, and also made them proper objects of *reverential* feelings? They are to be *reverently* eat and drank. But why reverently? Did our Saviour and the apostles eat and drink them reverently? If so, then the five thousand must have eat the loaves and fishes reverently, for there was just as much consecration of these as of the bread and wine. In truth, there was only a rendering thanks to God in either case. Why, then, the question returns, forbid that they shall be carried out of the church, and why command that they shall be eat and drank reverently? and why, too, I may add, is the minister required "*reverently*" to place "what remaineth of the consecrated elements" upon the table, "covering the same with a fine linen cloth?"

* Let the reader hold fast to the fact, also, that there is nothing, absolutely *nothing*, in the New Testament which sanctions any act of consecration of the elements whatever; and that this practice comes to us backed by no higher authority than it can derive from its heathen origin, and a transmission through the Roman Catholic church.

Why, but because some mysterious change is supposed to be wrought in them, such as I have shown to be fairly taught in the writings of leading English divines, and in the language of the communion office? The same general idea is implied also in the rubric which requires the interruption of the communion for the purpose of consecrating more bread and wine, if they chance "to be spent before all have communicated."

General Aspect.

We have been viewing the *particulars*, one by one, which go to make up our sacramental system. It may be well now to group them together, that the reader may see their general aspect.

We have seen that the leading English divines believed in a "change," or "mutation," effected in the elements of bread and wine at the time of their consecration; that this change is a "spiritual" one, in opposition to the Roman notion of a "carnal" change; that the change is "real" and "true," and is "into the body and blood of Christ;" that, in consequence of this change, they "really convey" to the believer the body and blood of Christ. We have seen, too, that these divines believed the baptismal water to be "changed into divine power by the working of the Holy Ghost," so as to "regenerate him that believeth." We have found our communion office teaching the same sanctification of the bread and wine, so that those who receive them become partakers of the body and blood of Christ; and the baptismal service bringing to view the same sanctification of water for "the mystical washing away of sin." We have found our catechism interpreting the whole for us by teaching the doctrine of *two*

parts in a sacrament,—making the sanctifying grace in the supper and the spiritual regeneration in baptism as essential to the being of the two sacraments, as the outward eating and drinking and the outward washing. The ordination office, and the forms of absolution, have unfolded to us the idea of a *priesthood*,—endowed with power to offer sacrifices to God, and with authority to declare and pronounce absolution from sin.

In addition to this positive verbal teaching, we have found an array of dramatic arrangements and representations, pointing in the same general direction, and distinctly implying the same errors. There is, first, the significant preaching and praying in separate places, and then the appearing in those two places in different habits,—both indicative of the double character of priest and prophet. Then there is the laying the priestly hands upon the elements, and making over them certain gestures, as if calling down some mysterious spiritual influence upon them; then the kneeling to receive them, as if they were objects of worship; and then, finally, the "reverently" covering them with a fine linen cloth, and the eating them with the reverence due only to what has been "*changed*" into the body and blood of Christ.

If any person mistakes this united teaching of words, and arrangements, and manipulations, and postures, I can only say, it seems to me a very needless blunder. It does appear to me as plain as the sun at noonday, that the great idea of sacramental grace is the basis and substratum of all these outward forms. Take this away, and they are as meaningless and inappropriate as a Mahomedan crescent carved upon the front of a christian pulpit.

No person, I think, need to wonder that we have "Puseyism" in our church. The only real matter for suprise is that we have not more. Here are causes enough for all the tractarianism we have, and for a vast deal more, too, unless they are removed.

CHAPTER II.

USAGES WHICH BEGET ROMISH FEELINGS.

THERE is another class of usages which, though not chargeable with teaching or directly implying erroneous doctrine, do yet engender a state of feeling very nearly allied, at least, to those fostered in the Roman church.

I claim that in this chapter I argue on a principle to a certain extent admitted in our own church. Bishop M'Ilvaine very properly, as I believe, refused last year to consecrate a church in the diocese over which he presides, because a piece of furniture had been placed in it which *looked* like a Roman Catholic altar. Now I beg to know what possible objection there could be to this piece of furniture, except on the ground that those usages which *resemble* Romish usages do in fact lead to Romish *feelings* first, and then through them to Romish doctrines? Why should a table, having the shape of an altar, suggest the Romish idea, except it be because it *looks* like one, has the Romish *aspect*, and therefore impresses the mind with the idea of something Romish underneath?

To the philosophical mind there may be, and is, a kind of ecclesiastical physiognomy, by which what is outward and visible determines what is internal and unseen; by which the *complexion*, the *aspect*, the *cast* of a thing, indicates its character. If we meet a man in the street, having the *complexion* of a Spaniard, we infer that Spanish blood probably flows in his veins. So, when a stranger enters a city, and passes a church with a cross upon it, his impression is that it is Roman

Catholic; and when one visits the cemetery at Mount Auburn, and sees a stone embellished with the same symbol, he takes it for granted that a Roman Catholic sleeps underneath. He may be wrong, but he is more likely to be right. Romanism has its badges, its marks, its symbols; and these are parts of a system, and are the indices of principles which lie out of sight. These things are so well understood, that when the outward marks are adopted, they generally react towards the principle. Without this, they are instinctively felt to be an anomaly, a branch without a trunk or root. And when they are forbidden to connect themselves with the parent root, like the banian tree, they send down the shoots from their branches to the earth, and into the earth, and *make roots* for themselves, congenial with their nature. There is, therefore, an ecclesiastical *physiology* also, by which outward parts seek nourishment from some unseen agency within.

I do not pretend that these usages necessarily imply or directly teach anything doctrinally false; but I do insist that they induce a state of feeling which gives erroneous doctrine a welcome reception, and in which it finds a nourishment highly favorable to its growth. Among the usages to which I refer, may be reckoned, in the first place,

The Multiplication of Crosses.

The demand for a symbolical use of the cross has been wonderfully increased of late. Let any man run his eye over the Episcopal books which have been published within a dozen years, and see how rapidly, during the last six or seven of those years, the picture of the cross has been multiplied upon the covers, the title-pages, and indeed upon all the pages. Ten years

ago, it was a comparatively rare thing to stamp a cross upon a new book. What has produced this change? Nothing, of course, except a *demand* for such pictures; and this demand is helping, — unconsciously on the part of many who aid it, — to encourage a system which exalts trifles into great importance, and constructs a sacramental and sensuous religion out of forms. As an illustration of this growing demand for visible crosses, the fact may be mentioned, that, in three of the older Episcopal churches in this city, the cross is not seen, while it is not only found in four of those more recently established, but, beginning with Grace, the elder of the four, in which it occupies an unassuming place upon the shaft of the baptismal font, it rises rapidly in prominence, according to the age of the parish, and in the Advent, the younger of the four, it swells to such dimensions, and puts on so much of the glare of conspicuity, as to have offended many of those who have helped foster the taste which has produced it.*

I think I have been told by the present bishop of our church in this state, that a few years ago there was not a cross in an Episcopal church in New York; now, crosses abound in them. If I am not mistaken, the same gentleman also informed me that when he visited England, some years since, he did not see a cross in any church. They are now numerous.

Sign of the Cross in Baptism.

As has been already stated, a paper was laid before the convocation of 1562, by archbishop Sandys, advis-

* There is a clergyman in the diocese of Massachusetts who makes it a rule never to purchase a book which has the picture of the cross upon it. So far, I honor him as a wise man, who looks to the bottom of things, and lets alone error before it is meddled with. Would to God that he did not stop with the symbol of the cross!

ing that her majesty, queen Elizabeth, be moved that "the collect for crossing the infant in the forehead be blotted out," on the ground that "it seems very superstitious" and "is not needful." We all know that this is practised in the Roman Catholic church. If any possible advantage could arise from the practice, or if it were recommended, or even hinted, in the Scriptures, the fact of its being used in the papal church would not be a sufficient reason for omitting it; but when we find that it has no sanction in the word of God, and is both superstitious and needless, and is one of the superstitions of the Roman church, it does seem as though a marvellous fondness for puerilities could alone prevent its rejection.*

Besides this sign of the cross upon the child's forehead, the church of Rome orders that the priest's fingers shall be put into its ears, as a sign that it shall listen to the word of truth. Now this, in my apprehension, is quite as expressive and beautiful a token as the cross. This apostate church also directs that salt shall be put upon its tongue, as a sign that its conversation shall be always with grace. This I regard as a *more* expressive token than the sign of the cross. The church of Rome furthermore administers milk and honey, in token that it shall love the sincere milk of the word, and keep God's commandments, which shall be sweeter to it than honey from the honeycomb. Now these are all very expressive and beautiful signs,

* The arguments used in support of this ceremony are generally about as forcible as that of James I., when pressed in regard to it by one of the Presbyterian divines, in the Hampton Court conference. His majesty desired to be informed as to the *antiquity* of its use; and when told by the bishop of Winchester that it was employed in the time of Constantine the Great, the king answered, "And is it come to that pass, that we must charge Constantine with superstition and popery? *If it was used so early, I see no reason why it may not be continued.*"—*Collier's Ecclesiastical Hist.*, vol. vii., p. 292.

—not a whit more superstitious than the sign of the cross, and quite as needful. If one ought to be retained, there is no possible reason why all should not. They are used together in the Roman Catholic church; are parts of a great system of superstition; have like significance and intent; and should stand or fall together.

Bowing at the Name of Jesus.

Of all the childish superstitions which our church has unfortunately retained, I have regarded the practice of bowing at the name of Jesus in the creed, as founded in a more genuine puerility than any other. It is one of those superstitions which are exactly adapted to the taste of a genteel, foppish tractarian, who is an amateur in all that relates to a graceful observance of the prescribed forms of an outside religion. To see such bending down with the grace of a young willow coquetting with a summer breeze, excites no surprise. But who, upon seeing a strong, Saxon-minded, christian man, attempting this flexion of the body in the midst of public worship, does not feel somewhat as he would to see the forest oak attempting to imitate the playful sports of the young willow?*

This bow is intended, I suppose, as a mark of respect paid to Christ. But the Scriptures teach us to honor the Son only *as* we honor the Father. To pay him higher and more marked honors than we pay the Father, would seem to be making an invidious distinction between the persons of the sacred Trinity; for

* The late venerable bishop Griswold regarded this practice with a great deal of dissatisfaction. He was accustomed to speak of it as one of those practices which commend themselves only to superstitious and sickly minds; and he has left on record one or two pithy, unanswerable arguments against it.

as we are to honor the Son as we honor the Father, so there can be no doubt that we ought to honor the Father as we honor the Son.

It is said, too, that at times of denial of the Divinity of Christ, this bow is useful as a significant recognition of his supreme Godhead, and of his right to our homage. But as those who deny the Divinity of Christ deny also the personality of the Holy Ghost, there would seem to be quite as much need of bowing at the point in the creed where the third person in the Trinity is named. Besides, if the Deity of the Son be dependent for support upon a bow, it rests on a basis far other than I had supposed. Were I a Unitarian, I would thank Episcopalians for the implied admission.

The Roman Catholic bows whenever the name of Jesus is repeated either in the worship or the sermon. This is consistent. Episcopalians, if they bow at all, should do the same.

Of the same character with bowing is the standing while the gospel is read; an act by which particular honor is intended to be paid to the words of Christ. But why should the words of our Saviour be more honored than the words of the Holy Ghost, spoken through the apostles in the epistles? And why, especially, should the words of Christ be more respected when read in what is called the gospel, than when read as the second morning lesson? Can anybody tell?

Holy Days.

An observance of days which do not relate to Christ is one of those parts of a ceremonialism which has been the occasion of much discontent in the church of England, and was, in the reign of Elizabeth, as I have

already stated, saved from dismission only by a proxy vote.

The chief objections to these are, that they strengthen a regard for a mere ceremonialism, and draw the mind back towards that bondage which the relics of saints, and all the attendant superstitions, so long imposed upon it. In times like the present, it would be no marvel to see saint-worship growing, as a historical sequence, out of the observance of saints' days. The Roman Catholic calendar is burdened with about one thousand seven hundred names. Compared with this, ours may seem so scanty as to be almost unobjectionable. But we must remember that it is not the number of names in the calendar which establishes the principle. The observance of one saint's day sanctions the principle and opens the way for the observance of any number.*

* Since writing this chapter, I have fallen in, as already mentioned, with a full English edition of Isaac Taylor's able and learned work entitled "Ancient Christianity." As this remarkably eloquent writer is a member of the established church of England, I shall avail myself of his strong reasonings and facts, to enrich my book with a few notes. I subjoin here the remarks with which he closes his criticisms on the English Church Calendar. It is but fair to say that the English Saints' Calendar is more full than ours, and is justly exposed to more serious objections.

"Is then the Calendar, with its inauspicious commemorations, a matter of no moment? Are the many objections to which, unquestionably, it is liable, frivolous? I have already declared my belief that the subject, unimportant as it may have been years ago, assumes, at this time, a serious aspect; and that it will connect itself with the great course of events now in progress. Christendom, as every one feels and sees, is hastening on towards a disruption, more signal, and more extensive in its consequences, than any that has heretofore had place. On the one side are the adherents of biblical christianity, and on the other those of whatever is human in religion; the first, advantaged by no visible organization, and having no centre of union, and guided by no conclave of concerted movement, is yet every day drawing nearer, part to part, and is reaching a clearer and a deeper conviction at once of that substantial unity which might lead them to a state of visible combination: and is also discerning more distinctly the common danger which is likely to cement all — by the bond of sufferings.

Use of the word Holy.

A system which exalts the outward forms of religion, especially the ministry and the sacraments; which contemplates and provides for the consecration

"On the other side, there *is* a visible coherence, and intelligent and well-directed concert, and political as well as spiritual influence, and economized resources, and a scheme of religion well adapted to the tastes of perverted human nature, and moreover a manifest tendency, throughout Europe, towards the restoration of a gorgeous and mystic spiritual despotism.

"In this present equipoise of spiritual forces, the position of the Protestant Episcopal church of England is — we must not say neutral, but ambiguous. It is not as if the church, strong in a calm unanimity of feeling, had taken up a position between the two parties, prepared to mediate, and to rescue truth from the expected collision of the two. This is not the fact; for the church, intestinely sundered in opinion, reels to and fro, between the two, apparently inclining toward the side of anti-biblical despotism, and yet in the feeling which pervades very many of its individual and private members, connected by vital sympathies with the church — *truly* catholic and protestant.

"At such a moment, when human sagacity must quite fail in the attempt to forecast the issue even of a year's events, no circumstances, no alliances, no symbols, are unimportant, which in fact stand forth as badges of filiation and paternity, and which may be appealed to as such, in some moment of ecclesiastical conflict.

"A day may come — and such a day seems to be at hand — wherein the church of England will be dealt with — not according to its intrinsic and ancient merits; but according to its badges — according to the colors it wears — according to its ostensible armorial distinctions. And it may be thus dealt with — first, by its declared opponents, who will snatch an incalculable advantage in thus denouncing the Episcopal church as a body decorated with the scarlet fringes and the meretricious ribbons of polytheism. Secondly, it may thus be dealt with by the mass of the people, whose rude impressions will be confirmed, while they listened at once to the denunciations of its adversaries, and to the plausible pretexts of Romish seducers.

"And next it may be thus dealt with by statesmen, who, finding the church resolved not to relinquish its symbols and bearings, will promptly act on the assumption that this pertinacity is not without an inward motive and a reason; and that, therefore, the church of England *ought*, in a legal sense, to be regarded as mainly one with the Eastern and Romish churches.

"Yet this is not all; for a moment may come when He who looketh down from the high heavens, and who deals with *public* bodies according to their *visible* merits, even HE who, in preparation for a day of terror, sends his angel to seal the faithful few in their foreheads, that they may be known as his, in the tumult — it may be that He will

not only of water, and of bread and wine, but of church edifices, bishops, &c., finds much use for the word "holy." Under such a system, we hear of holy church, holy priesthood, holy table, holy communion, holy baptism, holy orders, and even holy days.

Under the old dispensation, there were great numbers of "things" set apart by divine appointment, for religious purposes, and called "holy." There were the holy garments, the holy crown, the holy perfume, the holy ointment, the holy chambers, the holy vessels, &c. Under the new dispensation, these things were dispensed with, being no longer needed. *Now*, men were not obliged to go up to Jerusalem to worship God, at certain seasons, where a priest might make an atonement for their sins; but he that would worship him in spirit and in truth, might do so anywhere and at any time. Mount Tabor was as suitable a place for worship as Mount Gerizim, and Nazareth as Jerusalem. All mountains and all valleys, all places and all things, were henceforth alike holy. Thenceforward there was to be no consecration except that of intelligent souls and human bodies; and nothing holy,

deal with the church of England according to its badges of ecclesiastical alliance!

"And what *are* these badges? They are those of the idolatries of an apostate church! The very same names, names recommended alone by, and known even to, this apostate power alone; commemorations which, through a long course of ages, have been the occasion of wicked delusions and infamous corruptions — these names, — these commemorations — these unholy holidays — these festivals of Satan — these anniversaries of blasphemy — these flaunting impieties, in the which everything truly sacred is hung up to scorn; these names, commemorations — festivals, which have been rejected by purer reformed communions, and are retained by the Romish, the Greek, and the Episcopal English, stand in the view of earth and of heaven, as broad notifications of party — they are watchwords held ready for mustering a host, — they are symbols on banners, which may be descried, and followed, amid the confusion of that last Armageddon-field, whereon are yet to be gathered all the antagonist forces of the world."—*Supplement*, vol. ii., pp. 99—101.

except God, and angels, and men, and those things which have moral qualities; no priest to offer sacrifices, and no holy garments for him to wear; no rites save those which were simple, and without incantations, and signs, and mysteries; and no worship except that which was spiritual and from the heart.

Hence, we hear nothing in the New Testament about holy things. Nothing is accounted "holy," under the new dispensation, except it has some moral quality. Peter once speaks of the "holy mount," evidently in reference to that wonderful visible display of the divine glory, the transfiguration; but nowhere else, I believe, is the word used, except with the limitation just named.

Romanism is a system which resembles, in many points, the bondage of the old dispensation. It abounds in "*holy things*," and attempts to put these between God and the soul, and to make them the channels through which all grace or holiness shall flow from the former to the latter. And just so far as we have holy baptisms, holy symbols, "holy mysteries," &c., are we under the ancient bondage.

PART V.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENT.

CERTAIN OPINIONS AND CUSTOMS ADOPTED BY THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, WHICH GIVE INCREASED ACTIVITY TO THE CAUSES OF PUSEYISM ALREADY DESCRIBED.

CHAPTER I.

THE NOTION OF CATHOLIC CONSENT.

It is not necessary to prove that the notion of what is called a "catholic consent" has become very prevalent in our church. The substance of this notion is, that the visible church of God being that against which our Lord promised that the gates of hell should not prevail, the great fundamental doctrines of the gospel have never been lost by it, but have been substantially received, *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, always, everywhere, and by all; in other words, that there has been a universal agreement, in the visible church, on certain doctrines.

The inference, practical and logical, which grows out of this, namely, the right of the church to control individual faith, belongs to the next chapter. I confine myself here to an unqualified denial that there is any such thing as a "catholic consent."

If there be any universal consent, agreement, unanimity, or whatever it may be called, it certainly may be found in the first ages of the christian era, or, in the "primitive church," which the homilies often say was "most uncorrupt and pure." If such consent

cannot be discovered among the fathers of the first three or four centuries, it surely need not be looked for elsewhere, for even if unanimity be discovered in subsequent times, it would lack the *always*, and would not be strictly *catholic* consent. But I deny that it has any existence, even in the writings of the primitive fathers. I intend to prove that the fathers, for the first three or four centuries, essentially disagree and contradict each other, in reference even to fundamental doctrines; and in doing this, I shall of course show that there is no consentient voice of the visible church during that period.

Before I proceed to examine this point, let me suppose for a moment that all the early fathers whose writings have come down to us have spoken in perfect agreement with each other. Of those who wrote during a little more than the first three hundred years of the christian era, only about twenty have sent down a portion of their writings to our day. Allowing, then, that these writers have spoken harmoniously; does this constitute a catholic consent of the church? Not at all. It is the universal consent of these twenty persons; but of the untold millions of Christians who made up the church during the different periods of those centuries, it is not the millionth part of a consent.

But there is no consent among those fathers whose writings have accidentally reached our times. See, for example, what they say of the Holy Ghost. Origen, a writer of distinction, calls him a *thing*, and says expressly that he was *created* by the Son. "We truly believing," his language is, "that there are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and believing that there is nothing unbegotten [or uncreated] but the Father, receive as the most pious and

true the opinion, that of all the things *made* by the Word, the Holy Spirit is the most honorable, and ranks higher than all things made by the Father through Christ. And perhaps this is the reason that he is not called the very Son of God, the only begotten alone being originally by nature Son, who appears to have been necessary to the Holy Spirit, *ministering to the formation of his person*, not only *with respect to his existence*, but *with respect to his being wise*, and *endued with reason*, and *just*, and everything which we ought to suppose him to be, according to the participation of those qualities of Christ which we have already mentioned." Other passages are found in Origen, in which he repeats, in express terms, that the Holy Spirit was *made* by the Logos.

Photius says that Pierius, who succeeded Origen in the school of Alexandria, delivers very dangerous and impious doctrines concerning the Spirit, for he affirms, that "he is inferior in glory to the Father and the Son." Theognastus, he charges with the same heresy. Novatian calls the Paraclete "inferior to Christ," on account of which, and other things asserted by him, Pamelius says he is not orthodox: and Ruffinus mentions the fact that the Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit, circulated his works for the purpose of sustaining their cause. Lactantius, in his letters to Demetrius, denies the entity of the Holy Ghost. Eusebius says the sentiment that the Holy Spirit was *made* by the Son, was the doctrine of "the catholic and holy church." And Jerome says, "many, through ignorance of the Scriptures," assert a doctrine essentially the same.

It is not needful to show that there are fathers, on the other side, who affirm the supreme divinity of the Holy Spirit. The supporters of a catholic consent will

allow this; for it is presumed that some of them, at least, would sooner yield the notion of a consentient voice of the church than admit that this voice is heard only in support of the opinion that the Holy Ghost is a mere thing, created by the Son. On the vital question, then, whether converted sinners have been renewed by an Almighty Sanctifier, or by some created being only, the fathers are by no means agreed.

And what is their testimony in regard to the ever blessed Son of God? Not a whit more harmonious than in reference to the Holy Ghost.

Athenagoras says of Christ, that "he is the first-born of the Father, not as a created being, (for, from the beginning, God, *being an eternal Mind, had the Word in himself, being endued with reason from eternity,*) but as having *come forth* to be the form and energy of all material things." Theophilus of Antioch speaks of the Word as the "mind and understanding" of God; and says that "when God wished to make the things he had resolved upon, he *brought forth* this Word as an eternal Word," &c. Justin Martyr says, "Before all created things, God begat a certain rational power, (*δυναμις λογικη,*) of himself;" and adds, that this is called Son, Word, &c.

These passages seem to teach that the Son existed *in the Father*, before his generation, as an *essence*, but not as a *person*. The writer certainly could not have believed in his eternal existence as the second *person* in the Trinity.

But see what Tertullian says respecting the Father and the Son. "The Father is the whole substance, but the Son a derivation and *portion* of the whole, as he himself professes," "For the Father is greater than I." And still further, "God is a Father, and God is a Judge; but he was not always a Father and Judge be-

cause always God. For he could neither be a Father before there was a Son, nor a Judge before there was an offence. But there was a time when there was neither an offence nor a Son." In commenting on the words, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God," Novatian says, "Nevertheless, this very thing, that he should be both God and Lord of all things, and God, after the form of God the Father, he obtained from his Father, being born and brought forth of him. Although, therefore, he was in the form of God, he did not think it fell to his lot to be equal with God. For although he remembered that he was God of God the Father, he never either compared or likened himself to God the Father, remembering that he was of his own Father, and that he possessed existence *because* the Father had given it."

I need not multiply these quotations. Admitting again, what all will allow, and what is certainly very true, that another portion of the fathers gave what is called the orthodox view of this subject, and we have before us the fact,—as stubborn as any fact in history,—that the fathers did not agree respecting the eternal generation of the Son, and his equality with the Father.

In the interpretation of the Scripture, as might be expected, there is as little consent among the fathers as in reference to the doctrines just considered. We have not space to allude to more than one or two. We select John x. 30.—"I and my Father are one." All the Ante-Nicene fathers interpret this passage as implying a oneness between the Father and the Son only in *will*, in *purpose*, in *affection*, &c.; and some of them quote, as a parallel passage, the language of Paul in reference to himself and Apollos, "He that planteth, and he that watereth *are one*." So unanimous are

these writers in giving this sense to the words, that Mr. Goode, — a man deeply versed in patristic learning, — says he is not aware that there is "any passage among the Ante-Nicene fathers, as showing the unity of essence between the Father and the Son." And yet, at a subsequent period, all the writers against the Arians, such as Hilary, Athanasius, Basil, Augustine, &c., give it this latter sense.

Take Proverbs viii. 22, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way before his works of old." Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, apply this to the divine generation of Christ. Irenæus applies it to the Holy Spirit. And at a subsequent period, when Arianism was prevailing, it was generally understood by the opposers of that, to refer to the generation of the human nature of Christ. Hilary thinks it was Christ who assumed a human form, and appeared to Adam in paradise, and afterwards to Abraham, and that these words refer to that taking of a human form. Here, then, are four interpretations given by the fathers to this passage, differing as widely from each other as the human from the divine.

According to a principle almost universally contended for by those who think much of the testimony of the early church, those who lived nearest the apostolic age are most to be relied upon. We often hear it said, that the sense put by the apostles upon prominent passages of Scripture must have been handed down to the earlier fathers, so that their testimony is exceedingly valuable, because it records what was handed down to them as a kind of inspired commentary on the word of God. Now, the facts I have adduced show two things: first, that a unanimous consent in the church in regard to leading doctrines, or in reference to the interpretation of prominent texts, is a

delusion; and, secondly, that the testimony of the early fathers upon the matter of fact as to what interpretation was given in the beginning to certain passages, is not reliable,—they testifying unanimously to an interpretation which every one knows to be wrong, unless the orthodox fathers of a subsequent period were all wrong, and the Arians all right.

Some Episcopalians may be ready to say, by this time, that they do not suppose any "catholic consent" has ever been expressed by the fathers as individuals; but that, whenever the church has spoken through general councils, they believe her voice has been consentient.

Some carry their views only to this extent, I am aware; but I can assure such that I have not been chasing a phantom; for there are multitudes among us whose sentiments are exactly met by the remarks I have been making. I am very willing, however, in view of this new class of objectors, to change my line of argument; and I now deny that "catholic consent" is to be found among general councils.

In the year 325, a council assembled, by order of Constantine the Great, in the city of Nice. It was composed of three hundred and sixty-five bishops. This council adopted the Nicene creed, which expresses, in very strong terms, the Deity of Christ. But what becomes of the "consentient" notion, when we learn that, at the council of Ariminum, held some twenty-five years after, at which there were six hundred bishops present, and which bishop Stillingfleet calls "the most general council we read of in church history," the doctrine of Arius was ratified and confirmed, directly in the face of the creed adopted at Nice? Augustine, when endeavoring to refute an Arian, had the magnanimity and good sense to admit that his oppo-

nent's citation of the council of Ariminum, was worth as much as his of that of Nice; and said the Scriptures were the only proper court of appeal in such matters. And sure I am that all who have looked at this subject with any care will approve his decision.

Such, then, is the view which facts give us of the so much talked of "catholic consent" of the church! The truth is, we cannot find enough of it to cover even the narrow ground occupied by the Nicene creed. For while Trinitarianism may claim a number of the Ante-Nicene fathers, and the decision of the *three hundred and sixty odd* bishops who composed the council of Nice, in favor of that creed — Arianism is permitted to boast of others of those fathers, and of the opinions of the *six hundred* bishops assembled in council at Ariminum, in support of the doctrines of Arius. I have no words to express my surprise, therefore, that any intelligent member of our church should be caught in the silly net of catholic consent. A more perfect *figment* never was invented; and yet the devil is at this moment using it to beguile unwary protestants, preparatory to the final ensnaring of them with the debasing papal dogma of an *ecclesia docens*. It is a cause of Puseyism of tremendous power.

CHAPTER II.

AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

The doctrine of a catholic consent leads necessarily to that of infallibility; for, if in all ages there has been in the church a universal doctrinal agreement, — in other words, if in all periods and all places, the same christian doctrines have been held and professed by all branches of the church, — this could have resulted from nothing else than an infallible power to perceive the truth, and an indefectible purpose to embrace it. And then, out of this infallibility grows the church's authority. A teacher who has been instructing the world for eighteen hundred years, and has never committed an essential mistake, may surely speak as one having authority. Hence, those who believe in a catholic consent generally claim the subjection of reason and conscience to the teaching of the church.

In the last chapter I denied the *fact* that the church has spoken with any such unanimity as is pretended. I now deny the doctrine usually drawn out of it, namely, the right of the church to control the faith and the conscience.

It is doubtful whether such a thing as a strictly *general* council was ever held; but if such a council were possible, its decisions would probably be the best exponent of the general church's views that could be had.

Let it be supposed, then, that, at the present moment, there is assembled in general council, in the city of London, a full representation from every branch of the visible church, in all parts of the christian world;

such a representation as will make a full, fair, and unquestioned expose of the prevailing sentiments of the whole body of professed believers. What will probably be the result of their deliberations? "Most likely," one will say, "they will quarrel, and break up in confusion, without settling anything." That, as they will be called to act on doctrinal matters, is not very improbable. But let us suppose they accomplish the purpose of their coming together, and pass, in due form, the requisite number of decrees. Will the advocates of catholic consent, and its attendant dogmas, pledge themselves in advance, to hold, believe, and defend all they decree? Perhaps this is a new question; but they must not shrink back from it. If they would be consistent, they must answer, yea. And to what will they probably be called to assent? The council is composed of Roman Catholics, Greeks, Armenians, Nestorians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, &c. In such an assembly, the Roman Catholic delegates, or they and the Greek representatives together, it is well known, will exercise a largely preponderating influence. They will outvote all others, and gain the sanction of the council for such decrees as they see fit to introduce. What, then, can be expected but a reënactment of the decrees of Trent, or something equivalent thereto?

I know it would be impossible to collect such a council as is here supposed, or to hold together its discordant materials until the full settling of its opinions; but it is not the less true, that, if such a coming together and such an avowal of opinions could be effected, the whole weight of the council's judgment would be cast into the scale of error. In short, it is perfectly clear, that, if the judgment of the whole visi-

ble church could be collected, whether by a general council, or in some other way, it would be in favor of transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, justification by inherent righteousness, and a variety of other errors, which, with these, overlay and obscure, if they do not destroy, the saving effect of the truth. To say nothing of the Greek church, which is but little less heretical, the Romish communion outnumbers all protestant denominations; so that the result of any outward expression of judgment on the part of the whole visible church, could not fail to be as I have stated.

I put four questions to the supporters of catholic consent, and the binding authority of the whole visible church's decision.

1. Do you *deny* that the voice of the whole visible church, if it could at this moment be heard, would be on the side of great and dangerous errors? Examine the subject. Study the symbolical writings of those bodies which make up the sum total of the visible church. Look into their statistics; and then, in the exercise of a prudent calculation, bring their suffrages together, and say whether you can deny what is stated above?

2. If not, do you still maintain that the decisions of the whole church are binding? These questions, you will see, have a bearing upon each other. It is important that you should settle, in your own mind, not one merely, but both. You are bound to admit the position taken, or prove from the creeds and statistics of the several denominations that it is untenable; and, if you find my statement to be true, you are bound to answer this second question in view of that statement. That you cannot drive me from the ground taken, is very evident. How, then, will you

answer the second question? I must of course conclude that you have thought of these questions, and that you are probably ready to affirm, that whatever the whole church shall judge to be true, and necessary to be received, that, the individual judgment is under the strongest obligations to receive.

3. If so, will *you*, as individuals, submit your judgments to the guidance of the general church? and will you hold and defend such doctrines as you have reason to believe would be sanctioned as necessary by such a general council as I have supposed? You will see that these questions very naturally link themselves together, and have a mutual bearing and dependence. If it be admitted that a strictly general council of the present visible church would sanction erroneous doctrines, and that the decisions of such a council would be binding on the individual conscience, then it follows that *you* would be under obligation to embrace any doctrine which such a council might propose to you. Are you ready to admit your obligation to do so?

4. If it be admitted that the judgment of the church may be settled by general councils, and these councils pass their decrees by the vote of the majority; if such councils may assemble at any time, and their decisions must be received as truth by christian men; then it follows that whatever a majority of those composing the visible church believe, *that*, if it can be discovered, every individual Christian is bound to receive, whether it has or has not been formally decreed. Are you ready, therefore, to receive transubstantiation, and such other objectionable doctrines as you are well persuaded a majority of the present visible church now hold, and would express, if an opportunity were given?

It may possibly be objected that I am arguing this whole question on too narrow a basis; that I am supposing those against whose opinions these remarks are directed to hold that the decisions of the whole church, *at any one particular period*, are binding upon individuals; whereas, their rule is, not only "everywhere and by all," but "*always*;" that they believe any doctrine, in order to be binding upon men, must not only be embraced by a majority of the whole, but that it must have been so held *through the whole period of the church's history*. I beg leave to say this consideration has not been overlooked. But if the whole church of one period may contradict the whole church of another, then her decisions surely cannot be binding on the conscience at any time, and the judgments of general councils can have no weight. Either, therefore, the authority of councils must be surrendered, or my argument must be admitted to stand on as broad a foundation as the subject admits. And if the authority of councils be abandoned, and the decisions of the church, *at any given period*, are decided to be without weight; if it be claimed that the idea of "always" must be added to the "everywhere and by all," then nothing in the way of authority can be urged upon the conscience until the church *shall have completed her history;* for "always," I suppose, must imply the whole compass of its militant existence, including the future as well as the past. This, at all events, is the common sense view; for if the church in any past age may differ from the church in the present, so the church of this day, and the church of past times, may essentially contradict the church of the future.*

* A tract issued by the Protestant Episcopal Society of New York has these remarks:

"The dissenter exercises his private judgment in deciding that he

Thus it is seen that the views I am combating have a very dangerous tendency, — resulting in the doctrine of the infallibility of the church, and the loss of private judgment.

is at liberty to judge for himself of the proper interpretation of Scripture, without any guidance from the church. The Romanist exercises his private judgment in deciding that he ought to follow implicitly the guidance of the church of Rome, without reference to Scripture. The member of the church of England, or of America, exercises his private judgment in deciding that he ought to follow the guidance of his church, so long as that church is led by Scripture, *interpreted by the consentient voice of the catholic church from the beginning.*"

The only difference which can be seen between the Roman doctrine and that here propounded, is this; — that while the Roman sentiment is based on the assumption that the *present* church is infallible, as well as the universal church through past ages, the above passage implies that the *present* church may err, and that we are therefore only bound to follow it when *it* follows the "catholic church from the beginning," which is infallible. The language of the tract takes for granted that the attentive ear may hear in the "catholic church from the beginning" a "consentient voice" respecting the doctrines of religion, and that by comparing the teachings of the present church with the infallible instructions of this unanimous voice, one may learn whether he may or may not deviate from the "guidance of his church."

This sentiment plainly involves an absurdity. It assumes that while the church through all past ages has been harmonious in its enunciations of truth, it has suddenly, in the present day, become fallible, and liable to break that unity of sentiment which has prevailed up to the present period. So that those learned divines who write tracts in the next generation may rejoice in being guided by a "consentient voice of the catholic church" up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, but will be obliged to interrupt their gratulations by expressions of sorrow and grief, that, at the period of time lying just behind them, a demon of error entered the church, and notes were sent forth, not accordant with that harmonious voice which has been heard from the beginning.

The truth is, this doctrine is a little more Jesuitical than that of the Roman church. The holders of it know very well that the infallibility of the present church is a doctrine which, in any undisguised form, protestants cannot, by any possibility, be induced to embrace. The object, therefore, is to be reached in another way. An undefined, inaccessible tribunal, called the "catholic church from the beginning," must be set up, "and a consentient voice" given to it, which utters only the infallible decrees of truth. So, to complete the delusion, and to withdraw the mind of the inquirer from the real object aimed at, the present church must be pronounced fallible, and the searcher after truth must be allowed, in the exercise of his private judgment, to

But I shall have missed my aim in pursuing this argument, if it shall turn out, that our church, neither in its standards, nor in the general current of its opinions, gives any encouragement to such notions. How, then, is this matter?

The homilies, as I showed in a former part of this work, have not been silent on this subject. They have not, however, spoken so much of the church in

deviate from it whenever he can discover that its teachings vary from this "consentient voice of the catholic church from the beginning."

We submit whether this doctrine does not as effectually withdraw the mind from any direct appeal to the Scriptures as the out and out Roman dogma itself. To our mind it certainly does. For to what is the appeal made? To the Scriptures simply, as the Holy Ghost, through inspired men, has spread them out before us without note or comment? No; but to the Scripture *interpreted by the "consentient voice of the catholic church from the beginning."* Now, this language is intended to fill the mind with a spirit of inquiry; but does it start the direct inquiry what the Bible means? No; but rather, *what the church says it means.* The appeal is to the church, as being a better interpreter of the mind of the Spirit than the record of inspiration itself. The Spirit has certain things to reveal to men. Certain inspired men are employed to make a record of these things; but the record does not make known what the Spirit wishes to reveal. The church must tell us what the revelation is. Disguise it as we will, therefore, it is the church, and not the Bible, to which this theory sends us for instruction. The form of it differs a little from the Roman doctrine, but in substance it amounts to about the same thing.

We need not stop long here to inquire into the practical value of any consentient testimony of the church in all ages respecting the meaning of the Bible, supposing it to exist; for it is evident, at the first glance, that it could avail those only who had mastered the accumulated theology of eighteen centuries. And how many are there among the laity who are sufficiently acquainted with the decrees of councils, and the opinions of learned men and doctors in all ages, to give any intelligible and reliable account of what the church has held from the beginning, be it harmonious or discordant? We shall probably be far within the limits of truth if we say, *not one in ten thousand.* And what proportion of the clergy could probably draw out from their minds at any moment a consecutive and well arranged view of the teachings of the church through all ages, upon the various doctrines of the Bible? Certainly *not one in a hundred.* If, then, the Scriptures are to be understood only as "*interpreted* by the consentient voice of the catholic church from the beginning," who can become wise unto salvation by understanding them? One in a hundred of the clergy, at most, and perhaps one in ten thousand of the laity!

its widest sense, as existing through all time, as of the particular *primitive* church. Nor will I affirm that the homilies have claimed for the *ancient* church even, any *absolute* and *unqualified* authority. That they do *defer* to the primitive church; that they claim for it *some* authority; that they put it forward as a sort of *umpire* in settling controversies, there cannot be a well-grounded doubt. For, in the first place, they quote it, side by side, with the Scriptures, thus—"We are taught by the Scriptures *and* ancient doctors." "Contrary to the which most manifest doctrine of the Scriptures, *and* contrary to the usage of the primitive church, which was most pure and uncorrupt, *and* contrary to the sentences and judgments of the most ancient, learned and godly doctors of the church." "It shall be declared, *both* by God's word, *and* the sentences of the ancient doctors, *and* judgment of the primitive church." "Thus you see that the authority *both* of the Scripture, *and also* of Augustine, doth not permit," &c.

Now let it be granted that the homilists believed and taught that a doctrine established by the Scriptures "hath no more need of the confirmation of man's doctrine and writings, than the bright sun at noontide hath need of the light of a little candle, to put away darkness, and to increase his light;" it is yet true that they have lifted up that little candle, and daringly set it down beside the great sun, with the *avowed intention* of shedding more light into the minds of opponents. They have *practically* made it a co-ordinate light.

It has been said that by the words "judgment" and "sentences" of the fathers, nothing more is meant than their opinions. Let it be granted—what then? So long as these judgments or opinions are made a

standard by which to decide certain things, what matters it what they are called? I claim the privilege to go below the surface, and lay hold of *things*, leaving those to play with names who deem it a suitable employment.

That I am right in saying the homilists do defer to the primitive church, appears evident from such language as this—"The primitive church, *which is specially to be followed*, as most uncorrupt and pure." If the word of God be the only standard, why is the primitive church "specially to be followed?"

Great mischief has resulted from this appeal to the fathers, because, especially, it is not legitimate. It does not establish what it was intended to establish. It sends the inquirer, for proof against the idolatry of saint-worship, and picture-worship, and relic-worship, to a period which is full of testimony *in its favor*. It represents the church as most pure and uncorrupt at the very time when it was most corrupt and impure. The distinguished Isaac Taylor, a member of the church of England, who is deeply read in patristic learning, and, withal, is one of the most fresh and vigorous writers of the age, has made out, on this point, a case against the homilies, which is to me,—and, could I spread out on these pages his learned array of facts and arguments, it would be to the reader,—astonishing beyond measure. He shows that the homilists commit great errors in citing the fathers, first, by incorrect references, and, secondly, by inaccurate quotations. He shows that they often attribute to one author words that were used by another; and, above all, that they give no heed to the context, thus citing them, often, to prove the very opposite of their known sentiments, and to condemn usages which their own writings show them to have approved and

practised. I can scarcely restrain the temptation to crowd *large* extracts into these pages; but that I must not do. Let the reader procure Taylor's "Ancient Christianity," London edition, and read the fifty odd pages devoted to this point, and the same amazement which fills my mind will, I have no doubt, fill his. The most that I can do is to give a few sentences from this author, and one rather long note. He says:

"I leave it to the ingenious reader to devise some probable explication of the astounding contradictions presented in the following passage, occurring in the 'Sermon concerning Prayer.' Inconsistencies so discreditable call, surely, for a revising hand."

He then gives the extract, and appends this remark. "How shall the protestant church contend with popery, while, by appeals such as these, to the fathers, it puts an irrefragable argument into the mouth of the Romanist."

He then goes on to compare the several allegations of the homilist with the authorities he adduces, and shows that the letter of Augustine to Paulinus, which the homilist quotes as high authority, is full of recognitions and professions of the very opinions and practices which he was laboring to disparage. He cites passages from Augustine, containing a "distinct recognition, and his explicit approval of a practice — at that time prevalent — of addressing fervent supplications to the martyrs, at their shrines, beseeching them to undertake the office of intercessors for the departed!" "Here, therefore," continues Mr. Taylor, "the complicated superstitions of the times, involving every theological error, are sanctioned by this 'doctor of great authority, and also antiquity:'— and yet the homilist can think himself at liberty to cite Augustine on the

protestant side, as one who '*doth not permit* that we should pray unto them' (the saints and martyrs!)"

Again; "O that men would studiously read and search the Scriptures!"—a most appropriate ejaculation, indeed, and worthy of a protestant teacher. But when all men shall actually do so, the consequence, we may be sure, will be, their utterly rejecting the pernicious guidance of those "ancient doctors" to whom the writers of the homilies so unwarrantably made their appeal.

Again; after attending to a number of quotations from Ambrose, as contained in the homilies, Mr. Taylor says, "To what purpose, then, may Ambrose be adduced, as disallowing the invocation of saints, or the practice of confiding in their protection? He himself habitually invoked them—he himself professes his confident reliance upon their merits and intercession!"

"'So saith St. Chrysostom, an ancient doctor of the church.' But what is it that Chrysostom saith? *not* that which the homilist affirms, but the very contrary! I need not here repeat or add to the citations already made from the undoubted writings of Chrysostom, in proof of the fact that this father warmly, and on all occasions, recommended the practice which the writer of the 'Sermon on Prayer' as warmly and constantly condemns."

Again; "The references to the ancient catholic fathers in the homily, 'Of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ,' are liable to the same kind of exception;—for, in several of these instances, if the whole case were fairly stated, that 'gross idolatry,' and 'mummish massing,' against which the argument of the homily is directed, would appear to have sprung

directly from the exaggerations of the writers who are adduced as witnesses on the protestant side!"

"A Romanist may find his advantage in almost every instance in which, throughout the homilies, an appeal is made against the usages of his church to the ancient doctors."*

* The reader will be gratified with the following forcible remarks, with which Mr. Taylor closes his criticisms of the homilies:

"I have adduced a sample only of instances in illustration of the mode in which the compilers of the book of homilies avail themselves of the authority of ecclesiastical antiquity, assumed to favor the doctrine and worship of the English church. If the entire number of such citations was to be analyzed, I think it would appear that, at the least, four fifths of them are liable to some specific and substantial exception: — many, as we have seen, on the ground of literary inaccuracies; or such a want of precision as betrays the practice of quoting at secondhand; or from some miscellaneous repertory, itself carelessly stocked; or from the unassisted memory.

"More than a few of these faulty citations are derived from writings glaringly spurious; and several occur nowhere in the works of the writers named.

"But the most remarkable of these exceptionable quotations are those — and we have seen that many such present themselves — in which a father is deliberately brought forward to give his evidence in direct contrariety to his actual opinion, and to his uniform practice; and is thus made to condemn that which, *on the very page referred to*, he most strenuously commends.

"Now let it be supposed that a revision, merely literary, of the book of homilies were judged to be necessary by the authorities of the church. Would not the editors who might be appointed to carry forward such a revision, think themselves absolutely obliged, in the due performance of their task, to collate and verify the entire mass of quotations therein occurring, from ancient authors? If so, we may assume it as certain that they would feel themselves compelled to rectify the numerous instances of merely erroneous reference, as to book, chapter and treatise. But again; must it not be thought incumbent upon them also to note, or actually to expunge, quotations from writings confessedly spurious? This also ought to be granted; and then what course should be pursued in dealing with those flagrant instances — instances which give so much advantage to Romanists — wherein a use altogether unwarrantable is made of the name and reputation of a father, to disparage usages and notions which he is well known to have constantly upheld and professed? It would seem strange indeed if, while removing from the book of homilies its harmless *literary* blemishes, it were still left burdened with the grave faults which nullify its cogent argumentation, and serve to embolden those whom it would abash!

"We advance then only one step further, and imagine that, in the room of quotations erroneous, or logically unsound, there were inserted

Thus it is seen that this homiletic appeal to these idolatrous fathers is fitted, in the very nature of the

in these homilies some simple statements of THE MERE HISTORIC FACT: That the various errors, corruptions, and superstitions, on the ground of which the church of Rome is so vehemently arraigned as apostate, prevailed long before the age of the papal usurpation, and may be traced to the 'doctors and bishops' of the third and fourth centuries.

"We are here supposing two things, both of which it seems reasonable to assume, namely, that from the formularies of the church, what is glaringly false in fact should be expunged; and that what is at once true in itself, and necessary to the argumentative existence and consistency of that church, should be acknowledged and insisted upon.

"But how momentous would be the consequence of so reasonable an expurgation! For it would then appear, not merely that the church of England is protestant in its spirit and doctrine; — for this is manifest already; — but that it is so CONSISTENTLY and HARMONIOUSLY!

"Were the formularies of the church relieved of blemishes — which, in fact, ought to be removed, in regard merely to the literary reputation of so erudite a communion — then would its adversaries on either hand lose all their advantage in argument: — and more than this, the church would cease to generate, as it has done, and does at this moment, an intestinal plague threatening its very life.

"All the seeming, or the real, strength of the argument urged by the present admirers of antiquity, or of the argument which they advance as members of the church of England, is derived from the alleged fact that the church itself *leans, not merely upon Scripture, but upon antiquity*. Let, however, this 'leaning upon antiquity' be analyzed, and critically followed through its details, and what is the consequence? From such a scrutiny arises an imperative necessity for rejecting, almost in mass, this appeal to the authority of the fathers!

"If our object at this time were simply to make good a charge of faultiness, on several counts, against the book of homilies, we might be allowed to have sufficiently acquitted our task. But what we intend is of far more moment; for we mean to affirm, that the PROTESTANT MIND of the Episcopal church, if disencumbered of what, in a merely literary and logical sense, ought to be rejected and expunged, would leave without even a pretext those who, entertaining a feeling and opinion diametrically opposite, yet hold their position within it, and subscribe its formularies.

"Although, by its homogeneity of style, its animation, its earnestness, and its force, the collection of sermons which the church pronounces to contain 'a godly and wholesome doctrine' sustains throughout an apparent uniformity of intention — the characteristic of consistent and mature minds — yet, when the mass comes to be more narrowly scrutinized, we are compelled to admit that beneath the surface *two elements utterly incongruous — two principles forever irreconcilable — are forced into an unblessed combination. It is impossible that any one mind, a mind reasonable and well informed, can embrace and assent to the whole: if the one element be received, the other by necessity is rejected.*"

* * * * * * * *

case, to do immense mischief. Mr. Taylor furnishes the most ample documentary proof that the legendary

"The mere question as to the literary quality of the book of homilies we quite reject, as beside our purpose. But the sample we have given of the monstrous faultiness attaching to its citation of ancient authorities serves to bring to view, in a tangible form, that dangerous linking together of antagonist elements which is now bringing on an ecclesiastical revolution.

"How little did the venerable men — the martyrs of the English church — imagine what they were doing, and what harvest for their country they were preparing, when, from a mistaken anxiety to conciliate the adherents of the ancient idolatry, they professed their submission to the very authors of that idolatry, *and admitted into the constitutions they formed the roots of the ancient delusion, and the germs of an after-growth of polytheism!*

"The first and inevitable consequence of this fatal mistake was, to necessitate the puritan-protest against that residue of deadly error — a protest as fully justified as it was nobly sustained! Unless this protest had been made and perpetuated, England would have differed nothing from Spain!

"The next effect, not less inevitable, has waited for its development to these times; and is now fast advancing towards its terrible crisis — a religious, and, perhaps, a civil, convulsion, springing from, and mainly promoted by, the reckless determination of hierarchs to re-establish among us a spiritual despotism.

"Elements essentially destructive one of the other may long repose in quiet juxtaposition, or apparent harmony. That is to say, so long as no agitation produces a collision between them; but not an hour longer; for, at the moment when a deep energy begins to heave the mass, these antagonist forces begin also a counteraction, which continues and increases, until a mighty convulsion gives to the stronger, or to the more active, of the two, the opportunity to oust its enemy.

"The stir of church-principles, in the present times, has just imparted this expulsive energy to that element of the ancient superstition which the reformers left as a lifeless mass (so they thought) about the foundation of the church.

"It matters not as to the issue, that this element is adjunctive — is separable in theory — is in itself worthless and utterly contemptible: — IT IS THERE; and it is there where sappers and miners are wont to deposit the grains that shall mock earthquakes the moment fire reaches them!

"There was a season which passed over England like an April sunshine, when the long-cherished wish of many hearts to remove from the church the dangerous admixture of ancient errors seemed not unlikely to be accomplished! But none at that moment were gifted with the moral courage, the religious integrity, and the political wisdom, that should have fitted them for the task of putting their hands to so great and good a work.

"The consequence might have been safely and surely predicted; a reäction the most natural ensued; and instantly, when all hope of reform was abandoned, a new feeling, having in it something of the

theology, prevailing at the period of time to which the homilies send us for instruction, had, at that very moment, reduced the christian church to a depth of superstition and moral degradation lower than those of the heathens by whom it was surrounded. And yet this is the period of which the homilies speak as "most pure and uncorrupt," and "specially to be followed." It is to the fathers of *this* period, sunk in polytheism, and every vice, that they send us, with hat in hand, as to "godly bishops," and "ancient doctors," of "great authority." Of so evil a tendency does Mr. Taylor regard this appeal, that he attributes to it, "in great measure," the "many reäctions towards Romanism in the English church." And Mr. Hallam, speaking of the state of things in the days of Laud, says, "An extreme reverence for what they called the primitive church had been the source of all these errors." *

The "authority" of the fathers! The very thought makes the heart sick. Whence came the papal system? Who were its originators and authors? Who stood like guides along the road, not only pointing out the way, but themselves walking in it, and directing the church in its passage over the track of primitive time to the city with seven hills? The *fathers;* those very fathers of whose antiquity and authority the homilists make so much account. The Roman system, with its multiplied abominations, did not take the world by surprise, springing upon it like the tiger upon his prey. It was not born at once, with all its parts entire, but was the result of a long and steady *growth*, — rising up in its enormous magnitude by little and

energy of desperation, came in as a reäction, strongly corroborative of whatever had seemed the most questionable in the liturgic offices. Human affairs not unfrequently present such an aspect of sudden contrariety." — *Supplement Ancient Christianity*, vol. ii., pp. 46 — 52.

* Constitutional Hist. of Eng., vol. ii., p. 86.

little; taking into its mass of unlawful things one unscriptural ceremony after another, and finally, when the whole *body* was complete, putting on the *papal head.* I ask again, Who reared this enormous structure of superstition, carrying it up, age after age, by placing one stone upon it, and then another, until the papal cap-stone was put on, with the attendant shouts of hell? And the answer leaps from every page of ancient history — the *fathers!* *They* it was who laid the foundation-stones on soil reclaimed from heathen possession, and with ceremonies congenial with the feelings of heathen converts; *they* who added rite after rite, ceremony after ceremony, superstition after superstition; *they* who encouraged, and aided, or rather *caused*, the growth of the papal system, until the pope became its only appropriate, and in fact its necessary head. There must first be popery, before there could be a pope; the papal system, before its papal director. And no man or men can show that anybody produced this system except the fathers. It is, therefore, the next thing to effrontery to claim for the fathers authority in matters of faith, or indeed to defer to them in any manner whatever. With just the same propriety we might defer to the tractarians. The fathers were on the way to Rome. They were producing a system which ended in crowning a pope. The tractarians are doing the same, and no more. I would as soon follow the one as the other. It was by deferring to the fathers that the tractarians got where they are. Their first tracts were in harmony with the sentiments of the earlier fathers. Their subsequent ones were exponents of the opinions of later fathers. Tract XC. brought them into the society and fellowship of the *tridentine fathers!*

Strange that theologians will not cease from man!

that they will not let alone the fathers! that they will not abstain even from appealing to the reformers! that they will not prove all things by the infallible word of God, and *consider that proof enough!*

I cannot but say here that I have been pained to witness, in the late controversies with tractarians, the continual appeals of our evangelical writers to the reformers. Among our writers of any note, in this country, the Rev. Dr. Stone is the only one I can call to mind who has left upon his pages the traces of a clear, settled, and resolute conviction, that the Bible is the *only* rule of faith, and a full purpose to assert its supremacy, *practically* as well as theoretically, in the face of a confused, fickle, and man-worshipping generation.

CHAPTER III.

TEACHING OF THE CHURCH.

The phrase, "teaching of the church," has become very common of late; and, considering the sense in which it is used, it would be difficult to find one of more evil tendency. What right has the church to *teach?* Who has endowed it with this prerogative? Rome talks much about an *ecclesia docens*, or *teaching church;* and this language, as she uses it, has some meaning. She means by it the body of bishops and priests, with the pope at their head, who are literally authorized to *teach;* to tell the people what they shall believe and do. But the protestant idea of the church includes the whole body of the *people*, as well as the priests; and it is an absurd idea that themselves, collectively, should be the teachers, and themselves singly the taught. Besides, the protestant idea I had always supposed to be, that the Bible and the Holy Spirit were the christian's only teachers. The church, I had thought, was the *publisher* of the gospel, not its originator; the bearer of good news, not the original promulgator of it; that her cry was, Thus saith the Lord, not, Thus decreeth the church; that she brought a message from God, not a decree from her own councils. The church is no *teacher*—has no *right* to teach. It is taught itself; and what it is taught it may *tell* to others—nay, it *must* tell it; its own life depends upon its telling it; and when it has done this, it must point to the source of its own light and instruction as the fountain of light and instruction for its members. The moment it rises above this humble office of publisher

of good news, and assumes the functions of teacher, that moment it usurps the prerogatives of God, and thwarts his benevolent purposes towards men. It is disseminating a false doctrine, therefore, to talk about the *teaching* of the church. It sends men to the wrong source for instruction. It begets a habit of attempting to settle all controversies by an appeal to the church, or the *primitive* church, or the fathers, or the reformers, or the prayer-book, or anything in fact, rather than the pure word of God. Such has been the result among us. Such appeals have been constantly made on both sides, during all the tractarian controversy; so that a direct and sole appeal to the Bible has become exceedingly rare. Scarcely any writer seems to think he has proved anything, until he has dragged forward some canon, or decree, or rubric, or article of the church. If the church can be made to speak in his favor, he has gained his point; if not, he has lost it, though Isaiah, and Paul, and John, and Matthew, should each furnish a score of texts which are pat to his purpose. Thus the word of God is depreciated, and the way is prepared for sinking it altogether out of sight, and for introducing in its stead the traditions of men. If God's word is *any*thing, it is everything; if it is not the *sole* rule of faith, it is not the rule of faith at all. God will not divide his glory with another. If men will not take his word and Spirit as their only teachers, he will not allow them to be rightly taught. Hence, when they begin to resort to the *church* for instruction, he generally permits them to be blinded, and to be led astray.

CHAPTER IV.

HIGH VIEWS OF THE MINISTRY.

Nearly all the roots of the ancient corruption which the English reformers left in the soil, have now, I believe, been uncovered and exposed to the reader; in other terms, the *original* causes of a relapse towards the old bondage are now chiefly under the reader's eye—all those causes, I mean, which were left at the reformation in the doctrines and formularies of the English church. But these, in due time, produced *effects*, which, in their turn, acted, and still act, as *causes;* and in some instances are more active than many of the original causes, though not found in the homilies, the prayer-book, or the articles.

Among these causes of later origin, may be mentioned, as particularly prominent, high views of the ministry. These have grown out of high views of the sacraments.

Ever since the reformation, two antagonistic views have been taken of the sacraments. One, the protestant view, represents them as "two simple, outward rites, constituted by divine appointment, to be, in the practice of the church, the expression or profession, on our part, of the possession of an inward spiritual grace, which we have divinely received,—or of our desire for spiritual gifts, which are to be divinely bestowed;"* the other, the Roman view, represents them as the sources of divine life in the soul, and the channels for conveying the grace needed for its continuance and

* Rev. Dr. Tyng's Simplicity of the Lord's Supper.

growth. This latter view being taken, the sacraments become the germinant points from which springs a system that reverses the whole order of the christian economy. Under this scheme, grace is no longer *sought* and obtained; it is first *prepared* by the priest, and then *conveyed.* The participator in a sacrament no longer takes it as a token of the life which has been already received directly from Christ; but it either conveys life to the soul, as is affirmed of baptism, or, as is alleged of the supper, strengthens a life already imparted. Salvation no longer hangs suspended upon faith, and repentance and prayer, and a holy life; but upon a constant and devout receiving of the sacraments. Out of this view logical errors grow somewhat in this order.

1. That some change is produced in the elements of bread and wine in the supper, and of the water in baptism; for it is very plain that bread and wine and water can do nothing for the soul in their natural state. In order to impart a new and divine life to the soul, or to invigorate a life already given, they must be made alive themselves; and in order that they may impart a *spiritual* life, the life with which they are endowed must be spiritual. In a word, they must be infused with the Spirit, or *spiritually changed* into the body and blood of Christ.

2. The sacraments being thus made the sources and the supports of spiritual life, and the necessary inference being drawn from it that a spiritual change takes place in the elements,—a logical necessity is created for a *priesthood,*—not for pastors and teachers, but for *priests,*—men to offer the sacrifice. For if grace is no longer obtained directly from Christ in answer to prayer, if the life and the health of the soul comes only through the sacraments, and if these are efficacious

only when there is a change in the elements, then there is absolute need of a class of men with power to work the mysterious change in them, to endow them with the precious boon of life, which they are to convey to dead or languishing souls.

3. Then comes the necessity of a still more mischievous error. The priest, thus endowed with the supernatural power of working a change in bread, and wine, and water, is in possession of a gift which no man can possibly have who has not been set apart to the priesthood in his particular way and manner. The persons, therefore, who thus endowed him, namely, the bishops, are essential to the being of the church. The priest, also, becomes absolutely essential. For as there is no life for the soul without the sacraments, and no life-giving sacraments without a change in the elements, and no change in the elements without the exercise of the miraculous power of the priest; then the priest who possesses this miraculous power must be retained, or the soul will infallibly be lost. This puts the salvation of the soul entirely into the hands of the priest; it gives him the power to infuse the gift of eternal life into bread, and wine, and water, and then to confer it at such time, in such measure, on such terms, and upon such individuals, and such only, as he will. And here is completed a system of unmixed spiritual despotism. For the priest, holding in his hand the boon of eternal life, offers it to such only as yield him a willing, uncomplaining, and constant obedience. From such as resist his will, he withholds the sacraments, and thus closes against them the gate of heaven.

4. Not only does a spiritual despotism grow out of the above premises, but there shoots off in another direction, from this thrifty sacramental tree, the spreading branch of "apostolic succession." For those bish-

ops and priests, endowed with miraculous gifts for working mysterious changes in material things, must receive their endowments from their miraculously endowed predecessors; not merely their power of *government*, but their power to *elaborate*—so to speak—and then to convey grace; a power on which depend the validity and virtue of all sacramental and ministerial acts; a power without which no man can validly administer the sacraments, or perform other clerical functions. Hence follow the dogmas, not only of "No bishop, no church;" but, especially, No bishop, no valid ministry; and no valid ministry, no life-imparting sacraments; and no life-imparting sacraments, no salvation. These sequences grow necessarily out of each other, and are linked together as with hooks of steel, so that the strongest dialectician has not the power to force them asunder.

Some may think it a merely fanciful idea that high notions in regard to the sacraments lead to high and exclusive views of the ministry. Regarding this merely as a philosophical question, I would not pretend to say that such is the only way in which a false estimate of clerical character and powers can be induced; but I do affirm that it can be induced very philosophically in this way: and it can, in fact, be historically verified that this has been the order in which the false views spoken of have made their appearance in the English church. For a long time after the reformation, high views of the ministry were almost unknown among English Episcopalians; nor were they embraced to any considerable extent, until preceded by a false estimate of the sacraments; and any upward tendency of opinions in regard to the priesthood has, at every period in the history of that church, and of the Protestant Episcopal church in the

United States, been preceded by a corresponding upward movement of opinions in regard to the sacraments.

The reader may find a confirmation of this remark, by calling to mind the fact that, in the reign of queen Anne, 1702, the lower house of convocation, having fallen into some dispute with the bishops, and fearing that they should be suspected of favoring presbytery, passed a resolution that episcopacy was of divine right. But when the proposition was sent up to the bishops, they declined to sanction it; notwithstanding the known determination of the lower house to charge them with favoring presbytery, in case they declined. They raised a dispute on that point, which finally divided the clergy; and out of this contention arose the terms *high* and *low* church.*

So necessarily do high views of the sacraments tend to exalt the priestly office, that Burnet says,† "After the schoolmen fell to examine matters of divinity with logical and unintelligible niceties, and the canonists began to comment upon the rules of the ancient church, they studied to make bishops and priests seem very near one another, so that the difference was but small. They did it with different designs; the schoolmen, having set up the grand mystery of transubstantiation, were to exalt the priestly office as much as possible; *for the turning the host into God was so great an action, that they reckoned there could be no office higher than that which qualified a man to so mighty a performance;* therefore, as they changed the form of ordination from what it was anciently believed to consist in, to a delivering of the sacred vessels, and held that a priest had his orders by that rite, and not by the imposition of hands; so they raised their office

* Burnet's Own Times, vol. ii., pp. 346, 347.
† Addenda Hist. Ref., vol. 1.

so high as to make it equal with the order of a bishop."

The reader cannot fail to see the force of this historic fact. So necessarily did exalted notions of the sacraments engender extraordinary claims in behalf of priestly power, that the wide distinction which had long been maintained between bishops and priests shrunk, under the necessary pressure of this idea, in the acute and logical minds of the schoolmen, to a point, and actually disappeared.

In this case, as in many others, that which was at first only an effect, being once produced, becomes itself a cause, and reacts towards the cause which produced it; and, as its legitimate effect, increases the activity and power of that cause. High and exclusive views of the ministry induce still higher views of the sacraments. When a certain class of clergy get to be the only dispensers of gospel ordinances, then these ordinances become, if they were not before, the only channels of divine grace. And thus, by a vicious action and reaction, the evils of an erroneous system are increased.

The Rev. Dr. Stone, in his great work on the "Universal Church," has furnished an invincible array of testimony, showing that the earlier English divines did not entertain high views of the ministry, and especially, that their opinions were not tinctured with a particle of exclusiveness. So abundant is the evidence he has furnished on this point, that, though it might be increased, it could not be made more satisfactory.

The reader may be ready here to propound to me the question — Why, if the reformers "left an element of the ancient corruption about the foundation of the church;" in other words, if their minds were not

purged of superstitious views of the sacraments, why did they not embrace the logical results of these opinions, namely, high and exclusive views of the ministry?

There were several reasons why they did not. In the first place, they were *themselves* charged with not having a valid ministry by the Roman church; and with that charge pressed upon them by so powerful a body, and in so offensive and dogmatic a way, they had very little disposition to imitate so unlovely an example, by turning to their neighbors, and making the same proud assumptions, and urging the same offensive charges against them. In the second place, the protestants of Europe were then but a handful of faithful men, who had come out of great darkness, and were liable at any moment to be crushed under the iron wheels of both civil and religious despotisms. While they exercised a firm reliance upon God, they still felt the need of encouragement and support from each other. The English churchmen, therefore, cultivated the friendship of continental protestants. In the third place, the reformers of England received not a little advice and assistance from the continental reformers in framing our articles of religion. These causes all acting upon their minds together, prevented the development in their minds of the natural results of the sacramentarian notions of which they had not wholly rid themselves. But the moment the offensive accusation of the Roman church began to be unheeded, and the several sections of the protestant army to feel competent to fight its battles alone, and the favors of the continental reformers to be forgotten; *then* the leaven began to work; *then* altars no longer stood isolated and alone, but priests appeared before them, and affirmed their *exclusive* right to offer the sacrifice.

CHAPTER V.

TYRANNIZING HIGH CHURCHISM.

The force of the present evil tendency of our system is greatly enhanced by certain customs among us which are tyrannous beyond measure; customs which, I am sorry to say, tend to destroy all manly freedom, and to introduce the habit of a blind following of such leaders as happen to be in high and honored places.

At about the period when the influence of the "Tracts for the Times" began to be felt in this country, there appeared somewhat suddenly, among Episcopalians in New England, a kind of general feeling that the outward forms and ceremonies of the church had been a little too much neglected; and that a more exact and earnest attention to them would give to our Zion a more divine and heavenly beauty. Confessions of neglect and short-comings in this behalf were heard on every hand, and strugglings after a more exact conformity to ritual observances were noticeable in various quarters. The church, the church, began to be the watchword, and right earnestly the watchmen rung it from the walls of Zion. It was heard from the pulpit; it was heard through the press. Every editor must make it prominent in his articles, or be censured as a puritan, and wanting in churchmanship. Men of fancy had only to rack their brains and invent some phrase or aphorism, which gave a remarkable and apposite prominence to "*the church*," and straightway it was heard from half our pulpits, became a part of every *true* churchman's colloquial furniture, and soon

even found itself conspicuously and quietly seated, as a motto, at the head of some two or three religious journals! And when a clergyman was found, who did not pronounce this shibboleth with sufficient frequency, I need not say how gossip caught up the rumor, and ran with it from mouth to mouth, that Mr. —— was not a sound churchman.

It is well known, that, in a short time, under this state of things, usages and modes of speech were introduced, entirely unknown to the canons or the rubrics, which it was disreputable, and almost as much as one's character was worth, to disregard. Amid the general shout of, "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these," many were terrified and awed into submission; more were charmed and delighted with the gaudy robes of the heavenly bride, as she swept back and forth before their excited imaginations; and still more were confused by the new and tumultuous shouts, and were hurried on, they knew not whither. Ministers began to explain from the pulpit the "principles of the church," and to get up courses of lectures, not only to explain, but to laud and magnify, "OUR EXCELLENT LITURGY."* "The wisdom of our church" became a phrase of such frequent use, that many really seemed to think that wisdom would perish from the earth if that church should be prostrated. "A good churchman" became far more talked

* The practice of explaining and praising the liturgy, and expounding "the principles of the church," by courses of lectures, I have seen adopted in several country churches; and in no instance, within my knowledge, has the effect been other than a serious injury to the parish. It has, in every instance, lowered the standard of vital piety, thinned the congregation, increased the prejudices of the community against the Episcopal church, originated disputes on topics which the people had previously thought nothing about, and has generally ended in raising up some three or four sturdy *churchmen*, who have thenceforward acted as faithful sentinels, by guarding every avenue to the church, and driving back the people.

of, and apparently more esteemed, than a good christian. "The church" once more became the holy "*mother*" of all the faithful; and hence, not only afforded *nourishment* for all her children, but became their teacher; in short, she became, practically, all in all to them. Then, too, we began to hear about "the gospel in the church,"* and "the church in the gospel;" "the church as a shelter to flee to;" the church as conservative of all that is valuable in the world.

This latter idea has been particularly dwelt upon; and "the church" has been lauded as a secure retreat from the alleged loose theology and loose government of those denominations which reject episcopacy. So much has this idea been fostered, that it has become a mark of *churchmanship* to be particularly clear on this point; and so strong is the desire of many now to maintain an irreproachable character for maintaining church principles, that they have not the moral courage to deal a manly blow at Rome, without at the same time making a petulant thrust at Geneva. Forms of speech which express this thrusting in two directions have become so common, that they meet us in many of our convention sermons and leading newspaper articles; and many of those who use them, if called to announce them suddenly, would be at no more loss than in pronouncing the benediction. Their stereotyped forms seem to be varied only by the different *metals* in which they are cast. Those who are fond of indistinctness will form them somewhat after this fashion: "We hope it will ever be the happiness of our church to pursue the middle way between Rome on the one hand, and Geneva on the other." One who

* When men begin with taking particular pains to see that *the gospel is in the church*, they generally end with turning the key upon it, and making it a prisoner for life.

has a little more distinctness in his composition, and a considerable *suaviter in modo*, will give them something like the following rotundity and fairness of exterior: "May the venerable communion, to which it is our happiness to belong, ever preserve that even balance of doctrine and discipline for which it has been so long distinguished; protesting firmly against the errors of the papal church on the one side, and avoiding those extremes into which some of our brethren of other denominations have unhappily run on the other." While another, who has a little more force and acerbity of temper, rings them out somewhat in this manner: "It will be a sad day for us when the venerable church of our choice ceases to protest alike against the damning heresies of Rome on the one hand, and the pestilent and schismatical fanaticisms of Geneva on the other." If those who patronize this folly could offer the Scottish bard's simple prayer, and receive answer to it,—

> "O wad some power the giftie gie us,
> To see oursels as ithers see us,"—

we are sure they would forsake it at once. So strong has its influence become, however, that few seem to be endowed with the moral courage to withstand it; and hence the majority are carried along, step by step, in an *upward* direction, magnifying the church in this particular and in that, placing it in the foreground of every picture drawn for public inspection, and in various ways drawing the attention of others to the irreproachable character of their churchmanship. So fanatical had this spirit become several years since, that episcopal institutions, periodicals, &c., had to be *labelled* with denominational letters, that all men might know at a glance to whom and what they belonged,

and that they had a character distinct and distinguishable from anything "*dissenting*" and *sectarian*. The paper long known under the beautiful name of *Christian Witness*, and which was at first contented to be simply a witness for Christ, was now filled with an irrepressible desire to speak also for "*the church*," and would thenceforward be known as the "Christian Witness and *Church Advocate*." The institution of learning at Hartford, which had borne the patriotic title of Washington College, could be satisfied with this no longer, and, like some whimsical individuals, applied to the legislature for another name, taking the more *church-like* title of *Trinity College*.

In this way, high churchism has been gradually advancing, and the moral power of resisting it has diminished in the same proportion. The relative distance between the parties of high and low is indeed about the same that it was some years since, but both parties have advanced in one direction. The Hobartism of eighteen hundred and thirty has become the Puseyism of eighteen hundred and forty-seven; and the New England low churchism of eighteen hundred and thirty-five has travelled upward in the same direction, and, with a few honorable exceptions, in eighteen hundred and forty-seven has taken its stand, —or rather, I might say, is passing across the Hobart platform. The New York Churchman was not so high church in its tone twelve years ago as the Christian Witness and Church Advocate now is. Let any man bring me the little flying "Banner of the Church," conducted in this city fourteen years ago, by the present bishop Doane, and Dr. William Croswell, and show me its high churchism; I will find him column for column, nay two for one, on the pages of the Witness, of the same kind of matter, only a little

more assumptive. Fifteen years ago, one half the clergy in Massachusetts and Rhode Island omitted, for the purpose of shortening the service, the litany occasionally, and the ante-communion service habitually. Now their churchmanship would not be worth a straw unless both were read every Sunday. Now, not one of them dares venture on even an occasional omission, though many of them are physically unfit to endure the tedious recitation. To venture on such an omission would bring against them the accusation — "He is no churchman;" a kind of moral martyrdom which none of them like to endure. Scores of things are approved among us now, which suddenly introduced ten years ago, would have caused a *revolution.* The beginning is always gradual; at first alarm, and a little opposition, then acquiescence, then *approval.* Two years ago, when the respected bishop of this diocese took his bold stand in reference to the church of the Advent, I had hope that the high church progress would be arrested in this quarter; but the evangelical clergy did not stand by him. They began soon to find fault that he carried the matter too far, because he refused to admit to his pulpit those who encouraged the Advent. And now he is virtually crushed. He thought nearly all the clergy were with him in that matter, but it turned out otherwise. Nearly half the clerical votes in this diocese were cast, at the last convention, for the rector of the Advent, as a member of the standing committee. In two years from this time, Mr. Croswell, I think it may be safely predicted, will be in better standing in this diocese than he ever was; and should I live ten years, it certainly would not surprise me to see half the clergy in the diocese of Massachusetts following his example, by reading the psalter and offering the prayers with their backs to the people.

None of them will ever imitate his rash experiment of wheeling entirely round at once; but it will not be marvellous to see them going *half way round* at first, after the prudent manner of the rector of St. Stephen's Free Chapel.

The high churchism of the Hobart stamp has been a source of great mischief in our denomination. It has in it all the elements of an aftergrowth of tractarianism; and can fail to be developed into this only in those minds in which either the opposing principles of the gospel are deeply imbedded, or logical activity is sadly deficient. That class of men who call themselves Hobart churchmen are doing as much injury in our church just now as any other class whatever. There is also a class of newspapers of the same stamp, of which the Calendar, published at Hartford, is a fair representative. These men, and these publications, are, to all intents and purposes, tractarian. Their whole current of thought and remark, so far as they fail to conceal it, is seen at a glance to be in the direction of Rome. They hold and teach, *virtually*, the doctrine of an indefectible, visible church; *infallibly* and *authoritatively* teaching the meaning of God's word; the doctrine of sacramental grace, conveyed through an apostolic succession, through baptism, through the Lord's supper, through confirmation, and the like. And yet these men and these journals, because they stoutly declare themselves not tractarian, are little guarded against, and, on the whole, are looked upon as only somewhat high in their notions, but in no manner dangerous.

CHAPTER VI.

FALLING BACK IN TIMES OF TRIAL.

Any attempted tyranny of high churchism would be harmless, were it not for the frailty which fails to stand unabashed in its presence. The vicious habit which some fall into, of praising the liturgy to excess, would do no harm if others had independence enough to abstain from following their example. It is not the high churchism of high churchmen, but the high churchism of the low churchmen, which does the mischief. It is the aping of high church practices on the part of low churchmen, and the extreme timidity of the latter, which induces them to yield to the former whenever the progress of ecclesiastical events brings on a conflict of antagonistic elements.

I have for the last fifteen years been an attentive observer of church matters in New England, and have been particularly interested in the several emergencies when principles have been at stake, and when, consequently, there has been an especial call for firmness on the part of evangelical men; and I am quite within the limits of fact when I say, our Zion has not come out of one of these conflicts but with the banner of her *churchmanship* lifted higher; in a word, low churchmen have invariably lost ground, and lost it through the moral cowardice of some of their leaders. They have failed to stand firm and resist, when the truth was in danger. They have had so strong a desire for peace, that they have seemed to forget that this is a state of warfare and of strife, and that unmixed peace is to be found only in heaven. Losing sight of the duty

of *contending* for the faith, they have formed compromises with their opponents, and accepted a policy, many times, which their own judgment condemned, for the purpose of avoiding strife. It has been painful to witness these vacillating acts, for they have been calculated to crush all moral courage and manly feeling, and to deaden apprehensions of vital truth, since they practically make that of little moment, which, theoretically, is declared to be all-important.

Two instances in the history of our church, in each of which the conflict of great principles has induced a crisis, and in which high church principles have gained their accustomed advantage, will illustrate these remarks.

In February, 1838, the Rt. Rev. bishop Stone, of Maryland, was taken to his reward by death. For two years and a half the episcopate of the diocese over which he presided remained vacant, though, if I have not been misinformed, the friends of evangelism had it in their power, at any moment, to have elected as his successor the Rev. Dr. John Johns, now the popular and much esteemed assistant bishop of Virginia. Several incipient measures were taken towards an election, but they resulted in nothing, because the high church party were resolved to fight for every inch of ground, rather than permit the elevation to the episcopal office of one so decidedly evangelical in his views. At length the low church party, tired of the threats of their opponents, and anxious to secure peace on any terms which would leave an equal chance for the preservation of truth, consented to a compromise, which resulted in taking the Rev. Dr. Whittingham, who had been recently engaged in some incidental controversies with Dr. Seabury, and who, they hoped, was moderate in his views, and would, at least, put no

obstacles in the way of spreading evangelical truth through the diocese. In fact, for the sake of present peace, they consented to take a man who was not their choice, and whom they regarded as far less likely to employ his influence and his talents on the side of truth.

Now what right had they thus to put the interests of the gospel in jeopardy? Where did they learn the expediency of purchasing a present and temporary peace at the expense of so great a hazard? Who empowered them to make a barter trade with their opponents, and to sell, in the best view of the case, one half the chances for preserving a pure gospel among them, for a little freedom from care and anxiety, and a release from the trouble of *fighting* the good fight of faith? I say *temporary* peace; for such it has proved. The man whom they took with the hope that he would do nothing to injure the truth, if he did nothing to advance it, has become a high tractarian, and is at this moment attempting to place his foot upon their necks, and to make them his vassals, and has already procured a decision by an ecclesiastical court in favor of inherent episcopal powers.

Another case, equally mortifying in its results, is the election to the episcopal office of the Rev. Horatio Southgate, as a missionary bishop to reside at Constantinople.

Mr. Southgate, it will be remembered, was sent by our church, some years since, on an exploring expedition through Persia, with a view to missionary operations in that direction, should the providence of God open the way. After some two or three years' absence, he returned to this country with a fund of useful information, which he published in two volumes. He was subsequently sent to Constantinople,

clothed with a kind of ecclesiastical plenipotentiary power for opening friendly negotiations, or forming treaties of amity with the decayed oriental churches in that neighborhood. The degree of corruption of doctrine and practice which had crept into those churches seems not at that time to have been very generally known in this country, and the exact line of duty which it would be necessary for Mr. Southgate to follow was not, therefore, very clearly defined. It was expected, however, at least by all the friends of evangelical truth, that he would do nothing to encourage the amount of error which he should find to exist, be it great or small, but should be wise as a serpent in devising means for recovering those churches out of the snare of the devil. From his first appointment to this mission, there were large numbers of Episcopalians, both among the clergy and the laity, who regarded the whole scheme as visionary, and the principle of fraternization with eastern churches as unsound and dangerous in a high degree.

Time passed on; and when the official reports of the missionary began to reach this country, and to develop his views and plans of operation, not only were those who doubted from the beginning confirmed in their feelings of opposition, but others were induced to take the same sceptical and opposing view of the whole scheme.

Time passed on again; and Mr. Southgate was in this country, and before the house of bishops as a candidate for the office of missionary bishop in Turkey. And how was the subject met? Not, there is good reason to believe, in accordance with the convictions of a majority of the church, but, in a spirit of conciliating compromise. It is well known that the foreign missions of our church are chiefly under the control,

and are mostly supported by, its evangelical members. That portion of the church, therefore, had this dragon's egg in their hand, and might have crushed it if they would. But bishops Doane, Ives, and Whittingham took Mr. Southgate under their special care; and, with threats of bringing trouble upon the church in case they were refused, they overawed the evangelical men, and procured for their ward a bishop's mitre. In the same way they procured support for him from the Board of Missions, though the foreign committee were unanimously opposed to his receiving it. The consequence was, that, with the full and swelling robes of office fresh upon him, he went out to Constantinople, where the Armenian patriarch smiled upon and caressed him, nay, called him his friend; and that he is now there as a kind of episcopal ambassador, with no other apparent duties but to eat dinners and exchange compliments with the heads of corrupt churches—allowing them to invoke his episcopal authority to prop their falling superstitions. He is no longer a preacher of a simple gospel, but a negotiator with the great ones of the earth—no longer an ambassador for Christ, praying men to be reconciled to God, but a high ecclesiastical minister of state, offering his compliments, and the compliments of his church, at a high patriarchal court. Who can wonder that Puseyism waxes strong and abounds, when evangelical men permit such things to gain the implied sanction of the church, notwithstanding they have the power to prevent it?

One of the reasons that defection has spread so far in our church is, that evangelical men, while they occasionally speak in a very spirited way of the sentiments of their opponents, cannot summon the moral force and courage to repress and kill one of their meas-

ures. I suppose the secret of the whole matter is this. There are men scattered along, at every conceivable point of the scale of churchmanship, from the lowest to the highest. Those standing at the lower end of the scale, who are the most sound in doctrine, not willing to displease and repel their intermediate brethren, lest they should drive them into higher positions, generally concede all they ask; and then, to reward them for their generosity, these intermediate men, whose sympathies are really with the class above, when any test question is brought forward, cast their votes with the tractarians. I have seen this game played, during the last twelve years, again and again; and I have never known a test question brought fairly to an issue, by which the tractarians did not gain, directly or indirectly, some advantage.

It is very evident that this vacillating course has made the evangelical party in our church appear, for the last few years, extremely inconsistent. There have been frequent occasions when clouds have arisen in the horizon just before the meeting of some convention of our Zion, and great anxiety has been felt respecting coming trouble. A convention has been known to come together in such a state of things; the clouds to grow blacker and more threatening, when suddenly all that was demanded by high churchmen would be yielded, the very clouds themselves would appear to dissolve and fall in showers of golden sunshine, lighting up all faces with smiles, and filling all mouths with thanksgiving that the *peace and unity of the church* had been preserved; when in fact peace and unity had been maintained only by a compromise of those principles on which the life of the church depended. In such cases, it has not been uncommon to see, on the following day, the highest tractarian walk-

ing arm in arm with the lowest episcopalian, and on the following Sunday to see them burying all their past misunderstandings by an exchange of pulpits!

Who can fail to see the inconsistency of such a course on the part of low churchmen? They regard tractarians as little better than open papists, and often say so without disguise. Would they admit papists to their pulpits, and make concessions to them for the sake of peace? Not at all. Why, then, do it in these cases? The people see these inconsistencies, and mark them. Hence their frequent indifference to the advance of Puseyism. They find that their ministers' opposition to it is altogether theoretical. They do not think it worth while to make war upon an enemy which the clergy fight only with paper balls. It cannot be a very dangerous theology, say they, which our ministers are willing to have expounded to us from their pulpits. In this way, tractarianism makes rapid advances. Evangelical men give it wings to fly with.

These evils have been much aggravated in New England by what has been called the conservative, but what might better be denominated the trimming policy of the episcopal church. I am only affirming what is within my own knowledge, when I say that, on the part of New England Episcopalian papers, there has been an *effort* to please both parties.

The evils deprecated in this chapter would be speedily cured, could there be induced among our clergy a heroic, daring desire for the suppression of error, which would induce them to throw themselves forward into the breach, fearlessly, and to utter their convictions with strong and vehement emphasis, without fear or favor; but so long as there is among them a cautious, calculating, fussing temperament, which

makes them nervous, timid, alarmed, when any bold and fearless word for the truth causes a sudden noise to break in their ears, or a tea-pot tempest to shake the knives and forks upon their tables; just so long will they be mere straws on the current of tractarianism—not impeding its onward movement, but rather serving to indicate the rapidity of its motion.

CHAPTER VII.

SOME OF THE FIRST STEPPING-STONES.

Satan never builds a temple for the votaries of error to worship in, without placing at a distance from it a few small stepping-stones, to make the beginning of their ascent easy.

The beginnings of an undue exaltation of clerical power, and of the consequent loss of popular liberty, are often extremely subtle, and sometimes entirely unnoticed. The forms of expression, "my people," "my church," which have been much employed by our clergy of late, are probably seldom thought of as having any evil import, or as indicating any unlawful assumption. And yet a moment's reflection must convince any one that they are based upon an inward sense of a right to control, to govern, to direct.

That such a feeling does lie at the bottom when they are used, is quite manifest from the fact that the claim of a right to control, &c., is generally put forth by the very persons who use them. Thus it has been often attempted of late to decide *for* the people what kind of reading they shall provide for themselves. I do not mean that efforts have been made to induce the people to read good books and newspapers, and to direct their attention to those which are most esteemed, — for this is manifestly proper, and perhaps a clerical duty, — but the claim is often put forth that the minister must be consulted, and his permission be obtained, before newspapers or books may be offered to the people. An agent often has the remark made to him, "I do not wish that paper circulated among my people;"

and I have known instances of a good deal of offence being taken because subscriptions for certain papers have been taken in a parish without obtaining or asking a clergyman's consent. Need I say how offensive such an assumption must be to persons who are in the habit of thinking and acting for themselves? This is one of the effective means by which the Roman clergy keep the people in ignorance. If I knew a man went to my minister to obtain permission to sell a book or a paper to me, I certainly would decline to buy, even though it were the very thing I wanted; and I would do so for the purpose of contributing *something* towards destroying a practice which is fraught with much danger and mischief. At the same time, my minister's opinion respecting any book or paper would have its due influence. The laity would do well to look to this matter—not, however, with the view of charging wrong motives or bad intentions upon the clergy, but to destroy the very beginnings of evil. Many ministers of the gospel adopt these forms of speech, and assume the rights here disputed; but do it without the intention of infringing on the rights of others, and with no other thought than that of guarding the church in which they minister against unhealthful influences. This being a praiseworthy desire, the people ought to avoid all impeachment of motives. But, however excellent the motive, it is still true that it is dangerous to attempt to cure one evil by the introduction of another and a greater. Spiritual despotism, which is all involved in what I am here contending against, is far more destructive of all that is valuable to the church of God than any evils that may arise from even an injudicious choice of religious reading. Besides, who shall say that the people are not capable of judging for themselves what are the

most suitable periodicals for them to read. In truth, as things are now going in our church, the laity are generally far nearer right in their views than the clergy. It was a remark of bishop Griswold, that "the hope of the church is in the laity;" and the numerous instances in which, within a few years, many of our diocesan conventions have been held back from ruinous acts solely by lay votes, prove the justness of the good bishop's remark.

It has often appeared to me that our ministers do much to increase the evil tendencies of our system, by the kind of conversation in which they engage in their social intercourse with each other. It is well known that much of their conversation, at such times, turns upon the strictly *outward* things of religion. The most proper arrangement of pulpits and desks, quite often, on such occasions, calls into exercise the most eloquent powers, and induces extended, and many times discriminating, remarks on their architectural relation to the other parts of the church edifice. The cut of clerical dresses, the propriety of their use, the material of which they should be composed, the need of a new supply in this, that, or the other church, the means of obtaining these articles for some poor brother whose parish cannot command the necessary funds;—these are very common topics of clerical conversation. The rubrics, too, furnish subjects of frequent conversational discussion. The exactness with which this brother or that observes them; the *meaning* of this or that rubric as it regards the *position* in which certain things are to be done; whether the people are required to sit, or stand, or kneel, during the recital of this or that part of the service; whether the rubric requires the doing of certain things before sermon or after, on every Lord's day or only at com-

munion seasons, with the face turned to the people or to the communion table, in the morning or afternoon, by the deacon or only by the priest;—*these*, and like things, are also fruitful subjects of conversation. In this way, a fondness for the externals of religion is cherished too often, to the neglect of its internal and more important matters.

At the meetings of our annual conventions, this attention to outward things takes another and perhaps more pernicious form. The bishop's address has come to consist, often, of little more than a recital of outward acts and services; and some of it is generally occupied in describing the architectural taste displayed in building some new church or churches, or in arranging a pulpit, a reading desk, or the accompaniments.

The parochial reports from the clergy are too much devoted to a congenial round of secular narrative. What has been given for the repairing of the church; some munificent donation for procuring a bell; a refitting and rearranging of the furniture of the church; the obtaining of a new and elegant prayer-book for the desk; the gift of a valuable communion service; the number of sermons preached; the fact that the regular services of the church have been used on all occasions of public worship; these are facts and themes which fill much space in the parochial reports, and take as great a variety of form as the sameness of the subjects will allow.

It is not pretended that these practices have any logical tendency to erroneous views, but merely that they *cultivate* a fondness for the externals of religion, and finally fill the mind and heart with them, to the exclusion of its inner essence or spirit. What is most talked of is generally most esteemed; and what is

most esteemed becomes at length of most importance. The practices spoken of are often adopted, not from any lack of interest in the higher and better part of religion, but from a desire to keep pace with the churchmanship of the times; and that which begins with putting the church into the fore-ground, generally ends in placing Christ in the back-ground.

CHAPTER VIII.

ARE THESE THE TRUE CAUSES?

All the causes of tractarianism which it is deemed necessary to adduce at present are now before the reader. Are they the true causes? If so, the remedy is simple and easy; if not, we are thrown back into the same ignorance which has permitted the periodical recurrence of the disease for the last three hundred years. With whatever indifference many persons may regard this question, therefore, it is still immensely important to know whether these causes are the true ones.

I think any persons might settle this question by propounding to themselves another. Does any one doubt that the *removal* of the causes specified would *prevent* the further generation of tractarianism in our denomination?

But the whole subject is met with several objections. The only one which has struck me as having any weight, or as entitled to much respect, is generally expressed somewhat in this form — "Puseyism springs from a corrupt nature — from sin in the heart. When piety runs low in the church, and unconverted men are introduced to our pulpits, a worldly, outside religion begins to be desired, and tractarianism is exactly suited to meet this desire. Hence, it is not anything in our liturgy, but something in man's heart, which occasions all our trouble."

I respect the objection, and shall, therefore, treat it respectfully. At the same time, I am obliged to say there is not a particle of truth or philosophy in it. To

run back to the depravity of human nature, and charge upon that the cause of any particular bad development, is an easy way for superficial minds to escape difficulty; but in this case it will not answer. Sin in the heart is the cause of tractarianism, just as it is the cause of every other evil in the world. But any discerning mind will see, that to announce this general truism, is to throw no light upon the subject whatever.

The citizens of Boston assembled last fall, in large numbers, week after week, to inquire after the *causes* of the juvenile depravity which was exhibiting itself in so many shocking forms in every part of our city. Suppose some individual had told the people collected on those ocasions, that their inquiries were easily answered, — it was *sin in the heart*, it was the *corruption of human nature*, which caused the wickedness so glaringly conspicuous. Would this have been deemed a satisfactory response to their inquiries? Would not the people have said, — you have told us a truth; but it happens to be a truth which has no bearing on the matter of our present investigation. We do not wish to know that human nature is in a condition to allow of wickedness, but we desire to be enlightened as to what has called out its inborn depravity into these revolting forms of immorality.

The element of papal corruption, lying at the basis of our system, does not act as the primal predisposing, but as the proximate, exciting cause of Puseyism. The predisposing cause (predisposing, I mean, not to tractarianism, particularly, but to sin and error of every kind) lies back of all exciting causes, and has its seat, of course, in the corruption of human nature. In *that* is found the spring whence issue all the streams of error; in *that* the fountain whence the

bitter waters are drawn out. But there is manifestly in human nature no inherent tendency *to any specific form of error or sin;* nor is it absolutely essential, as far as I can see, that human nature should be developed into all the forms of doctrinal and practical profligacy of which it is capable. Christians pray not to be led into temptation, with the view, I suppose, that their evil natures may be repressed, and that their tendencies to unbelief and sin may be checked. Christian parents think it necessary, too, to keep their children, as far as possible, removed from the bad influences that are in the world, that is, from the exciting *causes* of sin; and in this way they often prevent the most terrible developments of wickedness, and save themselves from the pangs of a broken heart. But in attempting to guard against these exciting causes, they do not overlook the deep-seated, primal cause, or rather fountain, of *all* sin in the heart.

No more does the writer of these pages, by exhibiting the exciting causes of Puseyism,—as he thinks he has done,—overlook the fountain of every form of unbelief and error, which is found in the depths of our fallen nature. If the corruption of human nature had any specific tendency to engender tractarianism, why, then, tractarianism would be the outward form in which it would everywhere develop itself; but it happens, unfortunately, that it is only among Episcopalians that it shows any such tendency. Why does not sin in the heart produce a relapse towards Romanism among all protestant denominations? Simply because it has no inherent tendency in that direction, and only produces such a relapse to any extent when *excited* by the causes specified. Our prayer as a denomination should be, therefore, Remove from us temptation in this direction; and our first care should be to remove

from our system those elements of evil which our reformers had not the power to extract.

Here I shall be met, very likely, with this objection—"Let it be granted that the removal from our system of what you are pleased to call a dangerous admixture would relieve us of all papal tendencies; the same elimination which freed us from this embarrassment would cut the tie which binds us to the objects of faith, and by eviscerating our religion of all mystery, would put us upon the downward slide into the great gulf of rationalistic scepticism."

Is it then true that the christian church must choose between the hell of popery and the hell of infidelity? Is a reception of christianity inseparable from one or the other of these bad tendencies? Such is the necessary implication of the objection I am considering. If this were true, we should be obliged to confess that christianity is a failure. But, thank God, it is not true. It is a libel upon the church of God. We *may* reject superstition, without embracing rationalism. We *may* worship God in accordance with reason, without reverencing reason to the neglect of God. We *may* cast out tractarianism, without rejecting faith; and we *may* embrace a reasonable belief, without accepting a rationalistic scepticism. For one, I totally reject the alternative. It is not necessary; and it is dishonorable alike to the christian religion and to its divine Author.

Yet it will be said (for it is often said) that in the case of those extreme protestant denominations, from which all those things have been cast out which I denominate superstitious adjuncts, there has been almost universally a falling away to infidelity, and that there is, therefore, no safety in putting them away. To this, I submit the following reply.

1. At Geneva, and in Germany, among the purely protestant churches, there has been, indeed, to a large extent, the alleged falling away. It occurred under the operation of mistakes which I have not the room nor the disposition to recite. Enough to say that these mistakes are at this moment correcting themselves, and that the protestantism of Switzerland and Germany is rallying, with every prospect of freeing itself, at no very distant day, from the errors into which it has fallen. Evangelical men have already been multiplied several hundred fold, and a reasonable hope may be justly entertained that the central seat of the great continental reformation will again acquire a name and a praise in the earth. We may draw from the history of the reformation in Switzerland and Germany this lesson. Human reason, employed to excess in religious things, and without a due regard to the divine reason, as revealed in the Bible, is one of those evils which are not hopelessly incurable,—it cures itself by its own excesses. The mind, plunged into the evils of infidelity by the excesses of its own reason, is always dissatisfied; and being free to think, to act, to struggle, is very likely, after feeding for a time upon husks, to return towards a father's house, and to be guided back by the ever watchful and merciful Spirit of God, into the regions of light and peace. But not so with the poor victim of papal despotism. Sink him to the lowest depths of spiritual degradation, and his chilled, torpid, and unreasoning mind lies still and unthinking, like the shell-fish at the bottom of the ocean; and if ever he is cast up upon the shores where the light of heaven can reach him, it is only by some moral tempest which breaks up the fountains of the great deep, and casts him, unresisting, along with dirt and sand, into a world of light and motion. There is hope for

a protestant church which becomes infidel; but not for one which sinks back into the embrace of Romanism.

2. My next reply is, that the charge is not true respecting the Presbyterian churches of Scotland and America. No churches in the world are more sound in the faith.

It is not true respecting the Baptist churches. Shoots have gone off from these which are unsound; but the original stock is good, and is endowed with a large share of vitality.

It is not true respecting the Methodist churches. They went out from the church of England — *rejected the very things of which I complain, or nearly all of them,* — retained an episcopacy, in this country, even stronger than that which they left; and their condition now proves, not only that the casting away of these things does *not* lead to a loss of the faith, and to a rationalistic infidelity, but that the retaining of them *is* the cause of a tendency towards popery, since no such tendency has been at all felt among them.

It is not true respecting the independent churches of England. There have been some defections among these, as there have been among all churches, but the great body of them are sound.

It is not true respecting the Congregational churches in New England. Infidelity has elaborated out of the free principles they have disseminated a few transcendentalists in Boston and vicinity; but the body of these churches is sound. They were never more numerous, never more prosperous, and had never better hopes for the future, than now.* Statistics, did I choose

* The following is taken from the Protestant Churchman:

"STATE OF UNITARIANISM. — The Christian Witness gives the following statement from the Christian Register, a Unitarian paper pub-

to employ them, would fully bear me out in these remarks.

There are quite a variety of alleged sources to which tractarianism has been traced by writers on this subject. A certain class of high churchmen have been fond of attributing it to a reäction from low views of the church, and from a loose state of things growing out of such laxness of views; but this is to take a superficial and unphilosophical view of the subject. Great movements, which affect large classes of men, always spring from principles which have laid hold of the foundations of opinion. In all matters of theology, there are germinant principles, or radicles, which, having taken positions in the soil, infallibly send up their shoots at those points where their vital forces are collected.

It is not pretended that the several causes assigned

lished in Boston. The question is frequently asked, 'Does Unitarianism increase in Massachusetts?' This is the reply of their organ:

"'If we look solely to our own denomination, we might be discouraged. True, there never was a period when Unitarians had so many churches as now, or when they had a more able or zealous ministry, or so wide a field. But, at the same time, here in Massachusetts, things are not as they were five and twenty years ago, when almost all the distinguished men of the state were Unitarians; when the literature, intelligence, public spirit, wealth, and social influence were almost entirely on that side. Now, the tendency is elsewhere, and the fashion, at least, if not the intelligence, of the community, is setting decidedly in another direction.'"

This little scrap from the Christian Register was copied into several of the Episcopal papers, and in a kind of triumphant way held up as evidence that Unitarianism had seen its best days; and yet, to serve another purpose, they were at the very time frequently attempting to show that in Massachusetts everything valuable in the gospel was gradually perishing—all the Orthodox churches were going, *through Unitarianism*, to infidelity! It has been extremely painful to see my Episcopalian friends thus catching at every straw which floats by them—pretending at one moment that Unitarianism is dying out, and in the next that it is augmenting by a gradual lapse in that direction of all the orthodox churches in New England. Such is not the way to gain the respect of others, or to serve the interests of truth.

in this treatise are of equal importance, or act with equal energy; nor yet that some of the less important of them, standing alone, would so influence or pervert a religious body as to attract notice. Nor, indeed, would the whole together be particularly mischievous, but for the manner in which they are brought into perpetual contact with the ministry, and to some extent with the people. The seeds of our errors are in the liturgy,—a book which is constantly *used*, and to which attention is perpetually drawn in a thousand ways. Were these elementary errors lodged in some old formulas, or confessons of faith, which were seldom looked at or thought of, they would do very little mischief. But the whole tendency of things in our church is, and generally has been, to enter into the spirit of our forms; to make them *practically*, as well as theoretically, our *standards*. Hence, all the poison there is in them is made active and operative. A dozen grains of arsenic, enclosed in a piece of bread, and lodged in the human stomach, would do no harm, provided it could lie safely in some corner, and not be disturbed, or brought into contact with the coats of the stomach; but let the gastric juice dissolve the bread, and the vital forces assault the enveloped poison, and then follow the retching, the vomiting, the spasms, the prostration, and perhaps death itself.

Finally, the causes of Puseyism here assigned *must* be the true ones, because they alone will satisfactorily account for tractarian phenomena. Whatever the causes are, they have acted with uniformity,—producing so settled and uniform a bias towards incipient popery, that it has required the most active use of all the protestant elements in the system, the most zealous vigilance of the truly protestant *people* of England,—nay, the intervention, at several periods, of the British

throne itself, to prevent a total and shameful relapse into papal bondage. We may assume it as certain, therefore, that the causes are not extraneous, acting upon the system from without; for then they would vary in the direction of their impulses, according to the varying conditions of the outward world. They must be internal—they must be of the system; and in what else can they consist than in that "external face of things, near to what had been practised in the times of popery," which has been fully exhibited? When the question was up, at the time of the reformation, whether this "face of things" should be retained, there was a powerful party of far-seeing men, who faithfully forewarned the church that "this outward resemblance *would make the old root of popery to live still in the thoughts" of the people;* "so that, if it made them conform at present more easily to the change that was now made, *it would make it still much the easier for them to* FALL BACK TO POPERY."*

It *has* produced a falling back, not only among the people, but especially among the clergy,—so that at each of the periods when a tendency to popery has appeared, there have been large numbers of them who have supported the remaining popish ceremonies; and, finally, it has induced so general a falling back, that they are now supported by overwhelming majorities, and are openly opposed by few. In the reign of Elizabeth, nearly all thought it best to remove them, and looked forward with hope to the time of their destruction. In the days of Charles I., a large number supported them; in the time of Charles II., a still larger number; in the reign of Anne, a yet larger, and in the present day, nearly all. The philosophy of those who

* Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. iii., p. 259.

opposed them at first looked to the bottom of the whole matter, and rightly predicted a relapse towards popery as their natural result. They have steadily operated in that direction—gradually enlarging the sphere of their influence in every age. The church has gone through all the stages of struggling against their influence; first unanimously striving to rid itself of them against the acts of parliament, and the will of the sovereign; then yielding to them in part, then further, and again further, and then entirely. It now remains for it to cast them off, or be "unprotestantized" by them. The sum of the whole matter is this: the Roman and protestant elements were mingled. They were forcibly held together by acts of parliament. The result is before the world; the former has been gradually overmastering the latter, and the time has now come, when they must be forcibly separated, or the christian world be pained with witnessing the destruction of the latter.*

* The above was written in my scrap-book about six months before I saw Mr. Taylor's work, from which I have introduced several extracts. The reader will see from the following that Mr. Taylor had entertained similar thoughts.

"It is thus at this moment, Cyprian and Luther are wrestling amain for mastery in the English church; and the one or the other of these spirits must be dislodged. A season of apathy may again come upon the church, and so the struggle may stand over to another day; but, at its next revival, the English church will either go over unconditionally to 'antiquity,' erasing from its formularies whatever in them is protestant, and will expel all who adhere to scriptural doctrine; or it will recover its lost ground, and become consistently protestant and biblical." —*Ancient Christianity*, vol ii., p. 110.

CURE OF PUSEYISM.

PART VI.

CHAPTER I.

REVISION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK AND HOMILIES.

The cure of Puseyism must begin with a purging of the prayer-book and homilies. This is essential. Without it, no prescription can be of any avail. And why should not this be done? Does anybody pretend that these formularies are perfect? Not when dealing honestly with their judgment. Then it is not impossible to improve them. Moreover, the preface of the prayer-book itself contemplates changes and improvements from time to time; and says that, "In every church, what cannot be clearly determined to belong to doctrine must be referred to discipline; and therefore, by common consent and authority, may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions."

The preface continues:—"The church of England, to which the Protestant Episcopal church in these states is indebted, under God, for her first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection, hath, in the preface of her book of common prayer, laid it down as a rule, that '*the particular forms of*

divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, BEING THINGS IN THEIR OWN NATURE INDIFFERENT AND ALTERABLE, AND SO ACKNOWLEDGED, it is but *reasonable* that, upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions, *such changes and alterations should be made therein* as to those who are in authority should, from time to time, seem either necessary or expedient.'"

Nor is this all. This preface says:—"The same church hath not only in her preface, but likewise in her articles and homilies, declared the *necessity and expediency of occasional alterations and amendments in her forms of public worship.*"

Who now shall say that the liturgy ought not to be touched, when it was the declared *intention* of the reformers that it should, from time to time, be "altered and amended," and when they affirmed it "*reasonable*," and laid it down as a *rule*, that it should undergo "changes" which should adapt it to times and circumstances? And yet, had I denied the canonical authenticity of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, I should probably have been treated with less severity than for urging the necessity of revising the prayer-book.

But the preface of the prayer-book advances another step. After referring to several revisions which had taken place, it adds:—"Her general aim in these different reviews and alterations hath been, as she further declares in her said preface, 'to do that which, according to her best understanding, might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the church; the procuring of reverence, and the exciting of piety and devotion in the worship of God; and, finally, the cutting off occasion of cavil or quarrel against her liturgy.'"

It is well known that those parts of the liturgy against which objections have been raised in this treatise have been the cause of much prejudice against the prayer-book, and against the Episcopal church. Those who defend them as proper, and who are unwilling to part with them, will acknowledge this. They, as well as I, know that nothing has so much hindered the growth of the Episcopal church. And the preface of the prayer-book, as quoted above, affirms, not only that "the particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein," are "things *in their own nature indifferent and alterable*, AND SO ACKNOWLEDGED," but that alterations *should* be made, when in this manner "occasion of cavil or quarrel against the liturgy" may be "cut off." I press home, therefore, upon the asserters of the "authority of the prayer-book" this very authority itself. As they will not listen to my plea, I bring the prayer-book before them, and allow it to plead itself for revision. And I ask those gentlemen who are so fond of accusing me of opposing the church, and of assuming to be themselves its exclusive guardians and friends, to come forward and show wherein I prove myself its enemy by urging what the prayer-book itself asserts to be necessary. It does appear to me a most marvellous exhibition of infatuation for the Episcopalian clergy, knowing, — as they do know, — that those things in the liturgy which I allege to be popish, and which the members of all non-episcopal churches believe to be popish, stand directly in their path, — hedging up their way to usefulness, and closing many a field of pious labor against a church towards which they profess to exercise the warmest affection, — should yet insist on retaining them, and frown upon every attempt to cast them out.

The way of our church *is* literally hedged up by these popish things.* The people do not, and will not, enter heartily into them. They may like some things about the Episcopal church; but to these they have a just and an unconquerable aversion. Our church may prosper in large cities, and among the aristocracy; but in the country its progress will be exceedingly slow and discouraging. The clergy may be active, exemplary and excellent men; they may labor with great zeal and diligence, but they will not be gratified with very full congregations, or be encouraged with flattering results of their exertions. They may explain absolution, baptismal regeneration, and other things very satisfactorily, as they think; but, with a few exceptions, the people will think for themselves notwithstanding, and will say, — We do not believe these as taught in the prayer-book, and we cannot believe them.

If, however, the clergy are willing to spend one half their time in attempting to explain to the people what *cannot be explained*, and to labor hard to advance a church which cannot be much advanced, rather than to permit the removal of those things which stand in the way of its progress, — why, then the laity have only to decide whether they will quietly and uncomplainingly consent to work with them under such dis-

* Bishop Griswold, the wisest man our church in this country has ever had, and who was better acquainted than any other man with the condition and prospects of the Episcopal churches in New England, thus speaks in his address delivered before the convention of the eastern diocese in 1837: — "The prejudice in these Eastern states against forms of prayer, and *the objections so generally made to some parts of ours particularly*, and to the length of our morning service, *are powerful obstacles to our increase.*" * * * * "When there shall have been *a judicious revision of our liturgy*, in the manner wisely recommended by our venerable brother, bishop White, deceased, *I doubt not but our churches will more rapidly increase.*"

heartening circumstances, and with so little hope of encouraging results. I hope they will not. I hope they will call for a revision of the prayer-book, and press it upon the clergy as absolutely essential to the growth of our church. They can make themselves heard on this subject if they will. They *ought* to do it. They should do it as a matter of justice to themselves. They are now burdened, many of them, with constant calls for money to support, year after year, feeble churches, which would at once acquire strength to take care of themselves, but for these relics of popery which drive away the people. They should do it out of regard for the church they have chosen as their own, out of love for its extension and prosperity. And, above all, they should do it from a desire that the gospel, which every branch of the church is commissioned to publish, may have free course and be glorified.

There is an absolute necessity that they should do this. In the strong language of Isaac Taylor, "Luther and Cyprian are wrestling amain for the mastery in the English church." And one or the other will have the mastery both in the English church and in our own. If the laity do not cast out Cyprian's superstitions, these superstitions will assuredly cast out Luther's justification by faith. Cyprian is predominant in the prayer-book, and Luther in the articles. That the prayer-book and articles do not speak the same language, *even in the public estimation*, is evident from the fact that the tractarians attempted long to support their views from the liturgy, no man appearing to feel particularly outraged; but the moment Mr. Newman tried to do the same thing with the *articles* in tract XC., so general and emphatic was the burst of

public indignation, that the further publication of the tracts was immediately arrested.*

Some suppose that our evils may be cured by legislation; that is, by the enactment of such canons by the general convention as shall deprive any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, of the *right* to construe our articles in harmony with the doctrinal matter of the decrees of Trent, or to make any of our formularies speak the language of Rome.

Legislation may possibly do something for us; but it cannot do much. Our chief danger does not lie in any attempt to efface the lines of demarkation between the decrees of Trent and the thirty-nine articles. Those lines can never be lost. The common sense of the people will treat with scorn any attempt to wipe them out. The danger, then, does not lie here. But it has been shown that there are many things in the prayer-book of which this cannot be fairly said. It has been proved that tractarians *can fairly* make out from that book a strong case. And although it might be an easy thing for the general convention to declare that the term regeneration, for example, in the baptismal service, means nothing more than an outward change of state, and to forbid the use of the term by the clergy in any other sense; yet the great body of the people, as well as some of the first minds in the clerical profession, would insist, not only that the word does in

* In saying this, I do not wish to be understood as endorsing *all* that is contained even in the articles; but only the general body of truth which they present. For example, I do not believe, with the twentieth article, that the church hath "authority in controversies of faith;" for the most ingenious logic cannot land such an assumption anywhere except in the destruction of private judgment. For if, when a controversy is up, the decision of the church *settles it for all her children*, then there is no private judgment; but if, after the decision of the church, there is still an appeal to the individual judgment, and each man *settles it for himself*, then the "authority" of the church has no existence in fact.

itself mean an inward and spiritual change, but that the whole baptismal service is framed in accordance with such meaning; and saying this from their inward convictions, they would see and feel the injustice of commanding the interpretation first named. The general convention might affirm, too, that the Episcopal church does not teach any presence in the bread and wine, or any change in these visible elements: but everybody sees that the whole service is framed and conducted as if *something* were done to the material substances to make them what they were not before. What then could legislation avail? Nothing, that I can see, except to raise endless disputes about the *animus* of the compilers of the liturgy. The only remedy is to strike out the mischievous passages, and make the liturgy thoroughly and consistently protestant. This would pluck the evil up by the roots; and by making it unpleasant for Romanizers to remain with us, would leave us an undisputing, a united, and a prosperous people.

CHAPTER II.

ABRIDGMENT AND SIMPLIFICATION OF USAGES.

The next thing needing to be done to effect a cure of tractarianism is to abridge the number of our usages, and to simplify such as are retained. This is also indispensable. We have seen that usages have a very effective way of teaching. They are full, many of them, of bad positive instruction, and many others of them, of vicious suggestion. So that, were we to rid our prayer-book of all doctrinal error, and to retain our usages as they are, we should yet be in danger, and could not boast of having clean escaped the snares of the enemy.

Let the usages of the church, then, be purged. Why should they not? Do those I object to, accomplish any good? What possible advantage can there be in having different places for preaching and praying? Who was ever made wise unto salvation, or had a holy thought suggested, by a variety of clerical dresses, or especially by a theatrical exchange of vestments during divine service? When was truth better enforced by a special conspicuity of the altar, or winged with a diviner energy by being published from one corner, and sent diagonally across the church? Has any prayer ever gone more directly up to the throne of God, or entered more readily into the ears of Jehovah, by being offered with the face to the communion table? Have any better views of the Lord's supper been induced by departing from the example of the Saviour and his apostles, and receiving the bread and wine in a kneeling posture? Have the

sacramental bread and wine, or the baptismal water, ever been made the better by heathen manipulations? Has a bow ever enforced the divinity of the Son of God, or a couple of finger strokes, in the form of a cross, upon a child's forehead, ever sunk the grace of God more deeply into his heart, or sent him, in subsequent life, more cheerfully forward in the path of duty? No; to each and to all, I say, no—not in any manner, not in any degree. Tell me, then, ye who support these things; if they do no good, for what are they retained? Why practise *useless* ceremonies? Is the christian, especially the christian minister, to spend his time in observing ceremonies which have no useful end? Is the church of God, placed in the midst of this wicked world, to busy itself about trifles which benefit no one?

But this is not the worst view of the case. These things are not merely useless; it has been proved that they do positive mischief; that they suggest and teach error; that they beget superstitious feelings.

Nor is this all. They drive away the people. They have operated steadily in that direction from the days of Elizabeth to this time. They destroyed the usefulness of many of the best divines of the English church, while Elizabeth was yet on the throne. They closed the pulpits of eight thousand of the English churches at one time. They drove two thousand of its best clergy out of the establishment in a body. They have filled the hearts of thousands of the truest sons of that church with sorrow, and grief, and indignation; have changed thousands of the friends of the establishment into its enemies. In short, the pestilence and the sword could not have been more effectual in thinning the ranks of the church of England.

And yet, suicidal as this policy is, these usages are

retained. There they are, in the prayer-book, in the practices of the church, — doing no good, producing false doctrine, engendering superstition, converting friends into enemies, thinning the church, putting into its mouth the cry, "My leanness, my leanness," filling the minds of the people with prejudices against it, and making it, not a praise, but a reproach, in the earth.

A plain scriptural duty has been resting upon the English church, and upon our own, from their origin, which is yet unfulfilled. St. Paul says, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no more meat while the world stands;" from which I infer that christian morals require the disciples of Christ to abstain from anything not essential, which offends a brother, or causes him to stumble. How the Episcopal churches of England and America can have so long felt like resisting the demands of this duty, while so many have been stumbling over these useless and unessential ceremonies, it passes my understanding to conceive. I leave the fact to stand before the eyes of men, as a mystery, not of godliness, but of unbelief.

At all events, I insist that those are not the true friends of the church who retain these things to its injury. Whatever their pretensions, they are its worst enemies. The world, the flesh, and the devil, combined, cannot hinder its growth, as they are hindering it.

The ministers belonging to the commission selected by Charles the Second for attending to the responsible duties of revising and thoroughly protestantizing the liturgy, urge a great number of objections to the book of common prayer, and lay down this rule, which

they thought should be followed in preparing a liturgy for public worship. It is worthy of special notice :

"And, therefore, in pursuance of this his majesty's most gracious commission, and the procuring of unity amongst ourselves, we judge meet to propose,

"First, that all prayers, and other materials of the liturgy, may consist of *nothing doubtful or questioned* amongst pious, learned, and orthodox persons, inasmuch as the professed end of composing them is for the declaring of the unity and consent of all who join in the public worship."*

A most wise and judicious rule! It is the only rule which can be made to harmonize at all with the charities of the gospel. Whence can a church, by any possibility, derive the right to put doubtful things into its formularies of worship? From any fair construction of the principles of mutual rights? Not at all. Every christian owes to every other christian the concession of whatever injures that other's conscience, provided his own conscience does not regard it as essential. This is a plain principle of christian ethics, and he who violates it is below the morality of his religion.

For the majority of a church to decline to give up a useless ceremony which wounds the consciences of a minority, merely because they have the power to retain it, seems very much like acting on the maxim of, "Keep all you have got, and get all you can."

It is a pity any should have so learned Christ. If a church employs a liturgy, it should be so constructed that it shall not occasion doubt or disquietude in the mind of any *christian* who uses it; for every member of that church, provided he is a true christian, is enti-

* Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences, p. 304.

tled to have a liturgy which shall not offend or hurt his conscience. This, I say, he is *entitled* to. To impose upon him a liturgy which is burdened with ceremonies not enjoined in the word of God, is to abuse and insult him in the very house of God, while professing to aid him in his religious duties.

To lay doubtful things upon the conscience is not only a violation of mutual rights; it is subversive of the teaching of the gospel.

In the letter which "the apostles, and elders, and brethren," sent to the disciples at Antioch, they say — "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these *necessary things.*"* *Necessary things; they* may be imposed; all others are improper. But who will pretend that the ceremonies objected to are *necessary?* I never yet heard them called necessary. I never yet saw an Episcopalian who would not say that they were *not* so. Then the gospel rule *demands* that they shall be thrown aside. To retain them, is to rebel against God.†

* Acts xv. 28.

† These remarks apply, of course, only to such usages as wound the consciences of believers.

CHAPTER III.

PURIFICATION OF OUR OWN MINDS.

Scarce a day passes without adding to the strength of my conviction, that there are very few minds in our church which are wholly free from the effects of the sacramental virus. The prayer-book has done its mischievous work among us to a very wide extent. It may be regarded as nearly certain, that any man who affirms the prayer-book to be free from error, and excellent in all its tendencies, is himself infected—that is, he has the seeds of error in him, and nothing will prevent their springing up and growing, except an uncommon share of the grace of God, or a lack of mental activity.* Nearly all our evangelical men, therefore, need to reëxamine the ground on which they are standing. In short, they must purge their own minds. This will result naturally from a purging of the prayer-book, homilies, and usages of the church. For when superstitious formularies and usages are corrected, superstitious views and feelings will die as a matter of course.

But there are certain things which evangelical churchmen ought to do at once. They should clear

* A man may be kept by either of these means from embracing undisguised error. A large supply of God's grace in the heart, or a warm and hearty embracing of the vital doctrines of evangelical religion, may give him so lively and keen a sense of the value of truth, as to induce him to repress and stifle any mental activity which should attempt to draw legitimate errors out of the elementary principles lying in his mind. So, on the other hand, a lack of intellectual activity may prevent the elaboration of error, though all its primary elements are lodged in the intellect.

their minds immediately of all *exclusiveness*. Nothing can be more unlovely than an exclusive spirit—nothing less in harmony with the spirit of the gospel. And surely it is not in keeping with the supposed views of evangelical men, for it is of the very essence of high churchism. Of the old-fashioned bishop Hobart churchmanship, the apostolic succession is the corner-stone. And yet many evangelical men among us have embraced it in the very sense in which it was held by Hobart—I mean the unchurching sense of no valid ministerial orders except through the apostolic line. There are two classes of apostolic successionists; the one affirming that not only the powers of government, but the moral qualities which fit one for discharging the peculiar functions of the ministry, and give validity to clerical acts, are also conveyed along the line of succession, so that a breaking of this line would interrupt the flow of divine grace to the church; the other declaring that, although no moral fitness for clerical duty is imparted in ordination, yet that all *lawful government* must come through the line of bishops.

Now, although this latter class does not believe in the transmission of sacramental power, yet, if they believe in the transmission of *office* or *government* through the episcopal line, I fear they have the root of the whole evil in them, and will not ultimately escape its power. For why should not the apostolic succession be as necessary to convey power to perform the peculiar *functions* of an office, as to convey the office itself? Of what peculiar advantage would it be to anybody that one man alone had the keys of his country's arsenal, if all his neighbors could enter the armory without keys? And, in like manner, of what distinctive advantage is *office*, conveyed by episcopal

ordination, if those who have not episcopal ordination, can derive from some other source the power validly to discharge all the functions of the ministerial office?

The tractarian view on this point seems to be the more consistent of the two. For, if God intended to confine the transmission of ministerial office to the episcopal line of ordination, it would seem reasonable to suppose that he would have conveyed, through the same channel, the qualifications for discharging effectively the duties of the office; for then the lack of qualification, as evinced by fruitless labors, would be an infallible evidence that the office had not been derived through the apostolic line. But since the ministerial acts of those who have not been episcopally ordained are equally efficacious with the acts of those who are, the inference seems unavoidable, that God never intended to transmit the ministerial commission through any line whatever.

I shall not pretend to impeach the correctness of our ordinal, when it says, "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' times there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's church — bishops, priests, and deacons." Granting that such a trine distribution of the christian ministry for several hundred years as a mere *historic fact*, may be very "evident" to the readers of "Scripture and ancient authors," it does not follow that such an arrangement of the ministry is alone lawful, or that it might not at any time be dispensed with. It is equally "evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient authors," that from the time of Augustus Cæsar, there has been at the head of that organic condition of society called government, this single order

of men, namely, kings. But the admission of this fact does not imply that it is unlawful to dispense with the regal form of government, and that the republican government under which we live is a wicked breach upon the order which divine wisdom has established.

It is well known that a large majority of the first bishops and divines of the English church held that bishops were not a separate order, *jure divino;* that ordination was confined to bishops exclusively by apostolic practice, and the canons of the church, *rather than by a divine enactment;* and it is known, still further, that, in a conference held by these bishops and divines, with Cranmer at their head, before the compiling of the liturgy, such an opinion was fully expressed. Now, the whole question whether episcopacy is perpetually binding on the church, turns on the question whether it is of divine right. If of divine right, it is perpetually binding; if not, it may be dismissed whenever the church shall see fit to dispense with it.

Moreover, the reformers did not seem to regard episcopacy as binding on the church; for in the preface of the prayer-book they say, "What cannot be clearly determined to belong to *doctrine*, must be referred to *discipline;* and therefore, by common consent and authority, *may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions.*" Now, if episcopacy belongs to "*discipline*" rather than to "*doctrine*,"—as of course it does,—we want no further evidence that the English reformers regarded it not only *not* of divine right, but as *not* perpetually binding on the church.

In these views I fully concur. My conviction is that *government*, civil and ecclesiastical, is of divine appointment; but that its particular *form*, in the one case as in the other, has not been made the subject of any positive divine enactment, but has been left to the moulding, under divine providence, of times and circumstances, in accordance with the wants of the race in its various moral and physical conditions.

I believe, therefore, that the preface of the prayer-book is right in referring to discipline all things not clearly included under the term doctrine, and in declaring that, without exception, they are, — episcopacy and the form of church government of course included, — *alterable at the pleasure of the church.* I have never seen the fact that our church takes this ground before stated; but here it is in the prayer-book. It cannot be evaded.

The exclusive views growing out of the divine right of episcopacy have no support, then, either in the Bible or in the prayer-book. No real progress can be made towards the cure of Puseyism, until evangelical men shall have discarded from their minds every vestige of the divine right of episcopacy.

Moreover, if we would get rid of our tractarian tendencies, we must cultivate christian union. We must abandon all our lofty notions, and step right upon the platform of christian brotherhood, taking every christian man by the hand as a brother and an equal, and according to the true gospel rule, esteeming others better than ourselves. The spirit of the age demands this of us. Without it, we shall, in the great race of love and charity, on which the protestant church is entering so earnestly, be left far in the rear. Our own life as a denomination demands it

of us. Without it, we shall be thrown, practically, in spite of us, into the society and fellowship of the apostate church of Rome. Our loyalty to Christ requires it of us. Without it, our position will more and more be found, of necessity, to be one of antagonism to him and his cause.

CHAPTER IV.

DISCIPLINARY CLEANSING OF THE CHURCH.

It is an acknowledged fact that there is a class of men in the bosom of the Episcopal church, whose views, feelings, and sympathies are essentially Romish. Is it proper that such persons should remain within its pale? Perhaps it would not be proper, so long as they can draw the elementary principles of their system out of the standards of the denomination, to eject them. But, these standards being corrected, according to previous suggestions, the next, and closing act in the cure of tractarianism, would be the exscinding of all Romanizers. I do not believe their ejection from the church would do any good, the standards remaining as they are; for the same causes which have produced these, would, in due time, generate as many more. The mere sloughing from the body ecclesiastic of the gangrenous portion would avail little, unless corrective influences were applied to the seat of the disease, and its power were broken in the heart of the constitution. Let *this* be done, and then, as tractarians are dead to protestantism, the moment the vital forces of our system can make a boundary line between life and death, they will be thrown off in the way that other dead matter is.

"Those energetic, evangelic principles," of which Isaac Taylor speaks, "which gave life to the preaching of Luther and his colleagues," and which are found in our articles, and in some parts of our prayer-book, produced, at an early period, their necessary

result, namely, a race of energetic, pure-minded protestants, who wished to remain in the church of their choice, and who therefore clamored for its purification. The Cyprianic influence being in the ascendant, these men were deemed heretical disturbers of the church's peace, and were therefore cast out. But this did not cure what was called an evil. Had the church cast away the *articles* and a few other things, and *then* cast out the puritans, puritanism would have perished *in the established church*, though it would have lived and flourished beyond its pale.

So now, if our church will first cast out Cyprianism, and *then* eject tractarians, Puseyism will perish like a tree plucked up by the roots. Let the last step in the cure of tractarianism, then, be the ejecting of tractarians. This is indispensable to the completion of the cure. Perhaps it would not do any harm to begin with this.

It is a singular fact that while Cyprianism and Lutheranism have existed together in the English church, and in our own, and that while these two conflicting elements have been producing Romanism on the one hand, and puritanism or pure protestantism on the other, all the expulsions from the church have been on the puritan side. Not a Romanist has ever been expelled. Mr. Newman remained four years after he was a Roman Catholic, and finally went out by his own choice. Dr. Pusey still remains, though holding all that is essential to Romanism. And there are men in our own denomination in this country, who are known to believe the doctrinal matter of the decrees of Trent.

CONCLUSION.

The writer trusts it has now been sufficiently demonstrated that there are in our system two irreconcileably antagonistic elements, the Lutheran and the Cyprianic. The theological annals of the church of England and of our own, spread out before us, as the results of these elements, two systems of theology, lying in latitudes as separate from each other as the northern and southern hemispheres, and with a boundary line between them as well defined as the equator.

If this be so, then any attempt to define or explain the causes of Puseyism which overlooks these antagonisms, is fundamentally erroneous, and can, at best, only make some indirect approaches to the truth.

From the history of tractarianism in England and our own country, we may learn two things.

1. We may learn that those who embrace high and strained views of the church, the ministry, and the sacraments, do not know whither they are going. They are much in the condition of men who have begun to make a free and habitual use of intoxicating drinks, who are on the highway to the drunkard's grave, but cannot be persuaded of the fact. Some of these men, to be sure, who have got near enough to the engulfing whirlpool to hear it roar, know very well where they are, and with foolish calmness meditate the fatal plunge. But the great mass of those who have embraced the seminal principles of tractarianism, and are just beginning to thread the inviting paths by which it conducts its votaries gradually

away from the high road of truth, are totally unconscious of what is before them. They think they are only cultivating a higher and more becoming grade of churchmanship. They are only helping to drive away from the church all loose views of the ministry, and low views of the sacraments, and are restoring those distinctively *church views* which a radical and undevout age has so nearly destroyed. But they never dream that they are putting the church in danger—that they are in danger themselves. Such a suggestion makes them indignant. They are blinded. They are just where the writers of the tracts for the times were just after they began the series. They are sowing the seeds of death, but they know it not. There are few who seem to be aware how many among us are in this condition.

2. We may learn from what has passed that there is danger in the very security which is felt by such numbers among us. Since there has been so general a failure to discover, and consequently a failure to remove, the causes of Puseyism, the fact of a feeling of security ought to be a source of alarm. There are large numbers of men among us, who are saying all is well, and who yet, by all they have said on the subject, have shown that they knew not whereof they affirmed.

It is time, therefore, that we throw off our slumbers, and begin in earnest to look after the true sources of our troubles. We are already, as a denomination, moving round in the circles of the great whirlpool which has engulfed many of our brethren. Some among us are looking gleefully over the side of the boat, and are rejoicing in the increasing swiftness of its motion; others, who would be alarmed if they knew the actual state of the case, have been so

deceived by the *gradual* increase of its motion, that they seem not aware of its having been increased at all; while others still, unmindful of the craft in which they are sailing and of the fatally winding motion of the element in which it glides, are trustfully gazing up into the deep and calm heavens, and are forgetting, in the contemplation of their majestic and settled repose, the unsettled and moving state of the treacherous element below.

Our awful misfortune is, that these latter classes attribute whatever change in our position they may be aware of, to some accidental wind which is blowing us, temporarily, out of our course, rather than to an irreversible and fatal whirl of the flood, on which our all is embarked. May God convince them of their mistake before we are engulfed!

Date Due

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

3453

BX
5100
W288
AUTHOR
Warren, Ira
3453
TITLE
The causes and the cure of Puseyism
DATE LOANED
BORROWER'S NAME
DATE RETURNED